

COUNTY OF KAUAI
KAUAI HISTORIC PRESERVATION REVIEW COMMISSION
Mo'ikeha Building, Meeting Room 2A/2B

MINUTES

A regular meeting of the Kaua'i Historic Preservation Review Commission (KHPRC) was held on Thursday, February 20, 2020, in the Mo'ikeha Building, Meeting Room 2A/2B.

The following Commissioners were present: Chair Victoria Wichman, Vice Chair Gerald Ida, James Guerber, Carolyn Larson (*arrived 3:08 p.m.*), Stephen Long, and Aubrey Summers.

The following staff members were present: Planning Department: Deputy Planning Director Jodi Higuchi-Sayegusa, Shanlee Jimenez, Marisa Valenciano and Alex Wong. Office of Boards and Commissions: Commission Support Clerk Sandra Muragin.

Prior to the meeting being called to order, Administrative Assistant to the County Clerk Eddie Topenio administered the Oath of Office to history mayoral appointee Carolyn Larson, serving a 1st term ending 12/31/21.

A. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:11 p.m.

B. ROLL CALL

Deputy Planning Director Jodi Higuchi-Sayegusa: Commissioner Guerber.

Mr. Guerber: Here.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Commissioner Ida.

Mr. Ida: Here.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Commissioner Larson.

Ms. Larson: Here.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Commissioner Long.

Mr. Long: Present.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Commissioner Summers.

Ms. Summers: Here.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Chair Wichman.

Chair Wichman: Here.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: All members present. You have a quorum.

Chair Wichman: Quorum.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Yes.

C. SWEARING IN OF NEW COMMISSION MEMBER

Chair Wichman: And swore in our new commissioner...

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Yes.

Chair Wichman: Member. Welcome, Carolyn Larson.

Ms. Larson: Thank you.

D. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Chair Wichman: And the agenda...we need a motion for the approval of the agenda.

Mr. Guerber: I move we approve the agenda.

Ms. Summers: I second that.

Chair Wichman: Is there any discussion on the agenda. All right, may I have a move to approve?

Ms. Summers: You did already.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Motion and second and just...

Chair Wichman: A vote.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: A vote. Yes.

Chair Wichman: Ayes. (Unanimous voice vote). Any Nays. (Hearing none). So moved. Motion carried 6:0.

E. APPROVAL OF THE JANUARY 16, 2020 MINUTES

Ms. Summers: Motion to approve the minutes.

Mr. Guerber: I second.

Chair Wichman: All in favor. (Unanimous voice vote). Any nays. (Hearing none). Okay motion passes. Motion carried 6:0.

F. HEARINGS AND PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: This is the agenda matter, where any member of the public can...is free to testify on any item on the agenda at this point. You can also choose to testify on the agenda item when that item, is called. Anyone in the audience wishing to testify at this time? Okay, seeing none.

G. GENERAL BUSINESS MATTERS

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: There are, none here.

H. COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: None.

I. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- 1. County of Kaua'i, Department of Public Works – Engineering Division improvements to Collector Roads, Portions of Olohena Road, Kukui Street, and Ulu Street, Federal-Aid Project STP 0700(085)**

TMK: (4)4-3-003:999, (4)4-4-005:999, (4)4-4-006:999, (4)4-5-008:999, (4)4-5-009:999, (4)4-5-010:999, & (4)4-5-015:003

National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106: Consultation with Native Hawaiian Organizations and Potential Consulting Parties.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: I believe we have the engineering division head, Michael Moule for presentation. Shall we disburse? Dim the lights.

Chief Engineer Michael Moule: Yes. Good afternoon Chair and the Commission.

Chair Wichman: Good afternoon.

Mr. Moule: My name is Michael Moule Chief of Engineering.

Set up projector for power point presentation.

Mr. Moule: Okay. So first thing, I should say, is that it does say Olohena Road, Kukui Street, and Umi Street. That's the full project but we split (that) into two phases which means it's only the Olohena Road. We went through (the Section) 106 process. So, with the full project and as far as APE (Area of Potential Effect), we're going through (the) 106 process. I should say, the APE (was) approved by (and) concurred with by SHPD (State Historic Preservation Division) (and) included the full project. Which included this section here, all of Olohena Road, from Kamalu Road down to Kahau Road which is just above Kapa'a Middle School. And then we also have a gap here, its been paved recently. And then we had originally scoped this part Olohena Road, from here to here. Anyway from the roundabout in Kapa'a down to Kukui Street and Kukui Street over the highway. Then also this piece of Umi Street. But these parts are not part of this current phase, (it) will be addressed in (a) future project. So, the action right now that we're looking at is really just the portion, mostly rural portion of Olohena Road between Kahau Road and Kamaka Road. And I don't know that I'll go into a whole lot of detail on most of the project plans. (I want to) just let you know what we're doing mainly. Maybe I should cover this and just describe it.

Covered projector.

Mr. Moule: Mainly what we're doing is move and resurfacing and shoulder widening along the portions of the road where there's room to widen shoulders without any significant earthwork. We're not planning to do any cuts and fills and that sort of stuff. And...

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: We're done with this portion?

Mr. Moule: No, leave it. I am going to probably show something in a minute. I am just trying to get there. And there are two bridges in this segment. One of which is the Olohena Bridge number two which was replaced about 15 years ago and that's after you turn off of...your coming up Olohena Road and you pass Kapa'a Middle School, you make that left turn and kind of go down the hill and you come down, go across that bridge. (That) two lane bridge with peg shoulders. And there's Olohena Bridge number one (which) is the bridge near the top of Kamalu Road. It's the one lane bridge on Olohena Road. And that (is the) bridge we are planning to make some changes too. And so I was – unless you want to see the entire length of the project and kind of go through page by page...(also) then showing you what kind of shoulder widening we're doing...I can do that. But, since that was relatively minor work of just shoulder widening within the existing grass shoulders (and) adding paved shoulders to the grass shoulders, I wasn't going to walk through that because it's a whole lot of sheets. But (as I said before) I can do that if you want to see it. But, I was really just going to move to the area of the one bridge because that is the one item that's there, that's more than just a little bit of earthwork and paving within existing grass shoulder areas. Does that sound reasonable? Okay.

Delay...Open file on laptop computer for projector display.

Mr. Moule: So this is the location of the one lane bridge, trying to zoom in...it's really slow today. So the area sort of between the dash lines and this white color. Here is the existing pavement and the existing bridge is right here. It's relatively small...kind of see these dash lines here. I'll come a little closer, right there, existing structure. And the proposed – in this area we're widening significantly because this is the one area of the road that's not (*inaudible*). So, this area here, is the proposed widening and this is the proposed new structure on the bridge for replacement structure for the bridge. This is a – existing structure (which is) actually relatively short. It's something like 17 feet long or something like that, it's less than 20 because it's not, it's not a Federal aid bridge. In other words, less than 20 feet wide or long, I should say. The (*inaudible*) structure is a lot bigger than the old structure and this has not been identified as a registered historic structure although it is older than 50 years old. And our proposal is to replace the structure with a new structure, a wider structure. And I will say that if we find that it would have an effect from historic property by replacing this bridge, we would take this out of the project and just not touch it with this project given the time frame of the project. So, we would keep the one lane road in place if we find that's the case through our work with you all and or with SHPD or any other people that we're consulting with because we don't have the time to go through the process of doing that. So, we might move this to a later phase and go through that process as part of a future effort. So our plan is to replace the bridge or not touch the structure at all at this point.

Vice Chair Ida: How wide is this...over here?

Mr. Moule: So...

Vice Chair Ida: And what is this?

Mr. Moule: So that little dash there to here, this thing you asked about, that's a driveway to a private property that we're actually trying to eliminate. We don't think it's – it wasn't a permitted driveway. People have to get driveway permits from us to connect to our roads and it's not permitted on this property. This parcel has several other – at least one other major driveway, which is the one they're supposed to use. So we're actually – possibly not going to be putting that in at all and just leaving that as unsurfaced area. But this is proposed as a paved driveway in this plan, but we're looking to take that out. The width of the...it's a good 10 plus feet wider, that widened area of the road, there is ten to twelve feet wider than (the) existing road.

Vice Chair Ida: So is that going to be cut or filled.

Mr. Moule: Well, that area, that whole area is relatively flat through there. There's a big wide – from the existing pavement here out toward this. This is a – someone built their gravel driveway like I said here. It's relatively flat, there'll be fill actually, not cut. So, the new structure is proposed to be a couple feet higher than the existing structure, I believe at this end. And I can show you that sheet as well, it shows that these are the structure, later in the plan set. And so I can do that. But that's...this area here would be some fill, it diminishes as you go this way with pavement on top. That's pavement. And then here. If I recall correctly the most fill was at the east, the east end of the structure.

Mr. Guerber: So, Michael, did I hear right, that you're going to replace the single bridge that's there now with this structure.

Mr. Moule: That's the proposal, it's either replace it or to not touch the bridge at all.

Mr. Guerber: And you're going to leave it as one, as a single bridge for now.

Mr. Moule: Well, our goal is to replace it with a two-lane bridge.

Mr. Guerber: Yes.

Mr. Moule: And, but if we find that the, that that there would be an effect on historic property by doing so we would defer that replacement to a future project and take it out of this project. Because we don't have the time with this project to go through the full process of doing that given our timeframe with the funds for this project. So we're – the main purpose of the overall project is to resurface the road, which is in pretty bad shape. And leaving this piece out while certainly some residences want to have (a) two-lane bridge here. Leaving this piece out doesn't detract from the main purpose, which is paving and providing the improvement of the two lane bridge is certainly what we'd like to do. But we would defer that, if we needed to do that in order to go through a proper process and all the necessary consultation for – going through consultation now but all the details as far what we might need to change the design to do a two lane bridge. We would delay.

Mr. Guerber: Is there any possible historic impact?

Mr. Moule: Well, that's why I am here, I guess.

Mr. Guerber: Well, I don't know.

Mr. Moule: I mean, I think the bridge is certainly older than 50 years. It's not a listed bridge but it's older than 50 years and you know through this process and through our work with SHPD and other consulting parties we may find that people say there's impact and we got to go through more steps. And if that's the case then we'll probably pull it out of the project. I just want to make that clear to you guys upfront because I don't want, you know, bait and switch or something like that. I am just saying this is where we are given the project is.

Ms. Larson: It's a distinct change going from a single lane bridge on a road to a double lane bridge.

Mr. Moule: Yes.

Mr. Long: Do you have photographs of the existing bridge and details as well as rendering and drawing of the proposed two-lane bridge.

Mr. Moule: Not sure if I have that all here. I have the drawings of the bridge. And then they'll be a sort of an image of the existing bridge within that and I can pull that up here.

Delay...Open file on laptop computer for projector display.

Mr. Moule: So this is the archaeology inventory survey for this project. I wasn't sure that I had them with me on this file but thank (*inaudible*) put them on there for me, so we do have it. So here's some pictures of this (*inaudible*) structure. So (a) one lane bridge, small concrete parapets, (and) waterline on the side of the structure. See a bit of a...there's still work head. Wall there. This is a drawing of the bridge, are there anymore? Here's an upstream elevation. Sorry I guess I have the bridge numbers wrong, this is number two, I guess. So, the wing walls. I can slow down if you want.

Ms. Summers: Are there any safety concerns with how its currently constructed.

Mr. Moule: Absolutely.

Ms. Summers: Well and that...

Mr. Moule: Yes, we want to replace this bridge for that, safety and just usability reasons. Because this being in a curve, (the) one lane bridge...there's no guardrails. All of that are things that we don't like to have on roads that carry over 5,000 cars a day.

Ms. Summers: And it has gained more popularity or that particular road, as people have moved...

Mr. Moule: Yes, this is one of the two main accesses to Wailua Homesteads. You have Oloheua Road and Ku'umoo Road and that's pretty much it, to get up to the homesteads. Well Kuamoo Road is a busier way in because it's closer to Līhu'e. This is one of our busier roads on the east side. Probably is – I guess Kawaihau and Ka'apuni might be as busy, but they're right up there as far as (the) county's busiest roads in that area. Kuamoo Road is actually...

Mr. Guerber: Kuamoo Road is a one-lane bridge on a curve.

Mr. Moule: It's a one-lane bridge on a curve on what's otherwise a two-lane road that's carrying about 5,000 cars per day.

Mr. Guerber: Five thousand cars.

Ms. Summers: And the proposal is to widen the road on each side of it to...

Mr. Moule: Yes.

Ms. Summers: Make that a safer approach.

Mr. Moule: Yes, that's right. So here's again some more pictures of the structure.

Ms. Summers: Do we know if the rock wall was built at the same time as the bridge or does it predate the bridge.

Mr. Moule: We don't have any plans for the structure.

Talked to audience, away from microphone.

Mr. Moule: So, we don't know exactly when this one was built. That's true for some of the bridges that we have and not others. This one (is) relatively small as I mentioned it's not long enough to officially be a Federal aid bridge, a Federal aid route, not a Federal aid bridge. So it's kind of confusing because we are using Federal funds for this (*inaudible*) which is why we're going through Section 106. Again, more pictures. And I think that's it for pictures. So, if I can show you now on the plan set sort of what's proposed. So again, you can see the existing structure here that you saw on those pictures, the rock (*inaudible*) walls, the small structure here.

Mr. Guerber: Are you going to build a new bridge above the old bridge?

Mr. Moule: Yes.

Mr. Guerber: So than the old bridge will still be there...

Mr. Moule: So I think...I am not entirely sure how much the old structure would stay. I know we're building it above the old bridge and I believe that the wing walls at least would stay. I think that the deck...

Talked to audience, away from microphone.

Mr. Moule: It wasn't clear to me looking at the plans honestly. Just reading the plans and I wasn't sure what the full plans was on that.

Ms. Summers: Yes, it's not showing that they're being removed...

Mr. Moule: No, it's not...

Ms. Summers: Its showing them as staying.

Mr. Moule: Yes, so I believe that they are...they are staying in place. But part of the reason for that is just from a constructability point of view. We don't have – we're building and the drawings show this as well. But, the (*inaudible*) bridge is here and we're putting a new bridge, half of it, above the left of, depending which way you look at the bridge. And we put traffic on that and then we'll build the other half on top of the old structure is one of the reasons for that, is build and preserve. I think preserve the structure and also make it easier to construct while keeping traffic on the existing bridge.

Ms. Summers: It appears, sorry, that you're also putting a barricade on each side of the bridge that is much taller than what is existing right now...

Mr. Moule: Yes...

Ms. Summers: It's like 18 inches. That looks to be 42 or something...

Mr. Moule: Yes, so yes...

Ms. Summers: So the safety aspects of it are...

Mr. Moule: Yes, here you can see a longer section of the bridge.

Ms. Summers: And then it's showing the side step...

Mr. Moule: Yes, sorry I just changed it. This is the elevation showing that, concrete barrier on either side (*inaudible*) section. There is the section you're talking about with the, yes 42 inch concrete. (It's a) pretty traditional concrete bridge rail and then they'll be guardrails off the end of that for safety purposes. So that's pretty much what we have proposed. I can go back to any of these images on the proposed structure or the pictures of the existing structure for your information.

Mr. Long: Michael, they do appear be a couple of historical elements. The stone wing wall and even the poured concrete parapet. Will either, of those two elements, be carried into the new structure.

Mr. Moule: Like I said a moment ago, I believe that the wing walls are not being removed as part of this project. But I would want to confirm that with our consultant if that is going to work. The parapets would need to be removed in order to put the new structure on. You would not be putting the new structure that much higher than the old structure. And the new parapets or railings would be a more official concrete barrier as opposed to the concrete parapets that are there today.

Mr. Long: On the new structure that will be built, (will it be) on to the side and over the existing structure where the existing wing walls will not be touched. Will the new structure have wing walls in some way that can carry that rock element through?

Mr. Moule: Oh, I don't think so because of the way this is designed to span over the old structure. I don't think there's going to be wing walls on the new structure, because it's well above the waterway. The waterways down with the old one.

Ms. Summers: You can see the footings are buried in the grade...

Mr. Moule: Right.

Ms. Summers: Actually just comes up, but it looks like it goes to the existing wing walls, which appear to be staying.

Mr. Moule: Right. That's right and as I understand it, that's correct. So, you can see here these are all the existing wing walls. Underneath the structure and no proposal to take those out

because they'll still be there to carry the water through the channel at the road crossing. And I think that's the reason why we don't need new wing walls is because they're standing in place.

Mr. Long: Is this Kainahola Stream.

Mr. Moule: This is not. This is Waiakea Stream, I guess.

Mr. Long: Oh, okay.

Mr. Moule: Waikaea. No, its Konohiki Stream, sorry, Konohiki Stream.

Ms. Larson: So the new structure is built on post.

Ms. Summers: Footings that are in the ground. You can, kind of see where they're showing the grade.

Mr. Moule: So these would be concrete footings...

Ms. Larson: Where is the grade?

Mr. Moule: So this is sort of the new road grade here, yes. And the existing grade is right there, see on the right side of the bridge.

Ms. Larson: So the entire footing would be buried.

Ms. Summers: Almost completely.

Mr. Moule: Yes, this footing would be – and we would fill around this footing too, probably, actually. So yes, both of these abutments. And footings that the abutments sit on would be visible with the new structure.

Ms. Larson: What happens to the – when there's a lot of water at this place. What happens when it floods?

Mr. Moule: You mean after this is built? You mean...

Mr. Guerber: No.

Mr. Moule: Currently.

Ms. Larson: What happens now when it floods?

Mr. Moule: I have not heard of any situations where this bridge has been over topped. The other old Olohena Bridge has been over topped. It was last year during the storm, two years ago (inaudible) the storm in April 2018. It did not took place at this structure but it doesn't mean it didn't happen, I just didn't hear about that happening. I will say that this new proposal was –

would leave the existing channel as is and then have more (*inaudible*) under the new structure for the overtopping effect (if it) did take place. But I did not, not aware that was (*inaudible*)...

Ms. Larson: But you're leaving the structure in there.

Mr. Moule: Yes, we're leaving the wing wall portion of the structure in...

Ms. Larson: So, there's no more room for water than the original...

Mr. Moule: Well there is, because we're not taking, I think we are taking the deck off, we're just leaving the wing walls. If you look here, I think that these, the deck portion is coming off, but the wing walls are staying in place.

Ms. Larson: So, the only thing that's remaining is the wing walls, of the original bridge.

Mr. Moule: Yes, that's correct. You can kind of see the plan view of how that would work. These would stay in place, the wing walls and I guess would be the abutment (also). The wing walls and the abutment, I believe of the old bridge here would stay in place to retain the soil behind you as that one has.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Perhaps we can phase into more of a discussion phase. Unless there's other...

Mr. Moule: I can cover this and bring it back up if you want. So it's not in your eyes at least.

Mr. Long: Michael, are there any elements of the new structure that will be exposed visually that could have some lava/rock wall facing.

Mr. Moule: I think it's possible that the concrete barricade...there's examples you've probably seen them on the north shore. (Like the) Lumaha'i area where the state has put some of the walls with the lava facing. Fake lava rock facing. Yes, make an actual lava rock that you can pull from the structure point of view...

Mr. Long: Right.

Mr. Moule: But what they've done up there is a face that would be that way that's something...

Ms. Summers: I've driven on this bridge many times and never saw the lava rock before so I was really surprised when you showed this photo, because I had no idea that was there. You don't see it as you're driving across it, at all.

Mr. Long: How about if you're walking or riding a bike?

Ms. Summers: I haven't walked or ridden a bike across; I've driven across it many times.

Mr. Moule: I biked across the bridge a few times (and) don't recall looking at the bridge though, so I can't say one way or the other. Going down (*inaudible*) fast (*inaudible*) the side of the road in front of you which is the way you want to go on that road because it's so narrow with traffic. So, I haven't rode up that road very much, maybe once or twice.

Chair Wichman: Any more discussion.

Ms. Summers: I want you to talk.

Chair Wichman: Me?

Ms. Summers: Gerald.

Chair Wichman: Oh, Gerald, sorry.

Ms. Summers: I want to hear what his take is.

Vice Chair Ida: You know, this is kind of a general comment of things, but I can remember back in the day when I was on this commission before, in the '80's. Now I realize from your presentation there's been an archaeological survey done on this project. How come we don't get to see this stuff? You know, in the old days we used to have archaeologist in here defending their findings and stuff in front of us and you're concentration seems to be on structural things but that's not all this commission deals with. I mean can you tell me who did the survey. When it was done and a summary of the findings. Were there sights found? Was there subsurface testing? You know...

Mr. Moule: So, the survey was completed last year as part of this project. Let me go to the summary. So there was a field inspection done by...

Talked to audience, away from microphone.

Mr. Moule: So, Joel Bautista is our project manager and was out there last September with Robert Becking, Ph...Robert Reckart Phd and David Buckley the DLNR (Department of Land and Natural Resources) SHPD archaeologist.

Chair Wichman: May I excuse you for a minute. Could you please state your name and what your title is for the record. Thank you.

Civil Engineer, Joel Bautista: Joel Bautista, Civil Engineer.

Chair Wichman: Thank you.

Mr. Moule: So maybe Joel, can you do a quick summary of what you guys did on that field.

Mr. Bautista: Okay, so in September of 2019 we met with DLNR and I think it was Bob Breckman from 'Aiea (*inaudible*) and we drove to the sight. And Bob and David (Buckley) they

kind of were discussing the work and they kind of agreed that because the work was going to be done already, paved already, that no subsurface testing be done over there. And we did identify that the bridge was historic. We talked about how it was that there was probably an earlier version of the bridge they weren't sure though but then the bridge as it was not they weren't sure when it was built but they were thinking anywhere from 1906 to 1912, something around there.

Mr. Moule: So, specific summary from the summary of the study that states that the; "it retains its integrity, location, design setting, materials, and workmanship feeling and association to be valued as significant under Criterion D for the historical bridge has yielded relative to the development of transportation routes with respect to residential and agriculture land use on the island. This further argued that as this structure is a common example of concrete slab bridge without any ornate characteristics and thus not eligible under Criterion C. No further historic preservation work is needed to supplement the documentation that is presented in this study." That was the summary, there's more details in the actual report, of course but that...

Chair Wichman: That's from SHPD from David Buckley...

Mr. Moule: I am sorry that...

Chair Wichman: That's from SHPD?

Mr. Moule: That's from the authors of the report that were...

Chair Wichman: Oh, from Robert...

Mr. Moule: Mr. Reckman. But the field it was done by...

Chair Wichman: With the three, right...

Mr. Moule: Three authors, Mr. Reckman, Mr. Barner and Ms. Goutay from ASA Affiliates.

Chair Wichman: Yes.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: So, did the study also accomplish, I mean surveying for archaeological deposits or important items throughout the project area.

Mr. Moule: Yes. I think we should have provided (*inaudible*) so you could look at, I agree.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: But were there any items identified through the study.

Mr. Bautista: No, so what was identified was that on the makai side, on the roadside that over there they wanted to have an archaeological monitoring plan, because they're assuming that there could be some remains that could be unearthed...

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: This is...

Mr. Moule: That's on the makai portion, the part we are not doing as part of this phase. That's actually one of the reasons we're not doing it because we felt the potential for discovering remains during that work and another challenge working in Kapa'a Town. We decided let's put this into two phases, we don't really have enough money to do all at once anyway, so let's put it out and handle the part that's the most significant...

Chair Wichman: Not sensitive.

Mr. Moule: From their point of view and be sensitive and do that now and come back to the other piece later.

Ms. Summers: So, did David Buckley give a synopsis or report or has SHPD come through with a thing or...

Mr. Moule: So we are in the 106 process. We have their concurrence on the APE, but we still haven't asked for their concurrence in the historic properties affected yet. This is part of the process before we – we are in the consultation process still and we get to that stage after this meeting. And after we finish our other consultation to ask them to concur with the no historic properties affected.

Chair Wichman: Any other discussion. Stephen.

Mr. Long: On the existing exposed wing wall the rock facing. Is it structural or facing?

Mr. Moule: I don't know for sure but based on my knowledge of similar structures I believe it is structural. But, that is the structure of those walls it's the...

Mr. Long: Right.

Mr. Moule: The CRM type (*inaudible*).

Mr. Long: But I feel that the rock facing, the structural rock wing wall are an historic element. And I feel that, that should be carried through into the new construction in a similar construction methodology which means that I understand that maybe the lava rocks aren't as structural as the concrete, but I would prefer to see some kind of cut rock facing even if it's not structural. And you have to do the concrete on the new wing walls as opposed to the you know the Disneyland concrete walls that are being done going out to Hā'ena. So, I guess my feeling is that (as a) commissioner on this commission is that there is a historic element. The rock walls on the wing walls and that element should be carried through esthetically into (the) new construction (with) similar structure and not necessarily structural...

Ms. Summers: I would argue because they're stained...

Mr. Long: What?

Ms. Summers: Well you're putting that onto – so they're wing walls right now. There are no new wing walls. If there were new wing walls, I could see replicating that. But you're talking about replicating it on the barricade or where would you replicate it?

Mr. Long: There's a new concrete piers. Correct.

Ms. Summers: Those are covered in dirt.

Mr. Guerber: They're totally buried.

Mr. Long: They're what.

Mr. Moule: Yes.

Ms. Summers: They're buried.

Mr. Moule: Concrete barricades on the side of the bridge.

Mr. Long: Right, so it's difficult for me to ascertain from the drawings that we were shown if there are any specific areas where the new construction is exposed and if it is I'd like to see the architectural elements carried out throughout the new construction.

Ms. Summers: And I can see in the drawings that...well, we could go back to the drawings because it shows it pretty clearly that those post are buried.

Mr. Long: So my question is, are there any of the new structure that's going to be exposed visually.

Mr. Moule: The portions of the new structure that will be visually exposed from the road would be the concrete barrier on the side. Which is replacing the concrete – the shorter end more vertically concrete parapets that were on the old bridge. I can show you the difference if you want to see the pictures, again. And then the...on the outside of the bridge you'd see the concrete barrier and you would see the concrete deck planks. So, it would be a deeper concrete section, probably. Let me see what that deck toll is here. Total of 42 and 62 inches.

Ms. Larson: The guardrails that lead into the bridge...

Mr. Moule: Yes, that will (be) metal guard leading onto...

Ms. Summers: Which are there now. I saw in your photo.

Ms. Larson: Which are not there now.

Ms. Summers: I thought I saw some in the photo.

Mr. Moule: There's not...

Ms. Larson: The guardrails does not complete the new bridge as I saw it. The guardrails come up to where...

Mr. Moule: Yes.

Ms. Larson: The concrete part of that bridge would be...

Mr. Moule: That's right.

Ms. Larson: Visually those pieces are somewhat like the rock walls that are on the old bridge because you have the rock and then you have the concrete.

Mr. Moule: Well they're in a different – I guess the wing walls sort of – the purpose of the wing walls is to separate the water channel from the embankment that supports the structure. And therefore, located in different place than guardrails which are to separate the road from (*inaudible*) side of the road, like drop offs into the stream with trees and things like that. So, they're not in the same spot but again the proposed was to leave the wing walls in place. And to get to your point I think that there's no concrete elements in a similar placement as the existing wing walls. We could put a rock face or rock structure to the only thing – the concrete elements it'll be there will be the actual super structure of the bridge will be visible, right the bridge deck itself and railings on top of that. The bridge abutments that support the bridge are going to be entirely, mostly, buried in soil...

Mr. Long: Entirely or mostly.

Mr. Moule: You might see...

Mr. Long: I mean...

Ms. Summers: The drawing showed a few inches.

Mr. Long: I see that. I am just saying is there an opportunity to express the rock wall historic element on any of the new structure. And its either completely buried or mostly buried. If it's mostly buried than there is an opportunity. You know the drawings better than I do.

Ms. Summers: So you wouldn't see it because of – well if you looked at that section you could see that it was about maybe six inches and that would be buried under the bridge decking. So you wouldn't – if you put it there no one would see it unless they crawled under...

Mr. Moule: Let me go back to that...

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: So just to maybe get towards...I believe the engineering division at this point is going through a Section 106 review. And so, at this point it sounds like it's more of an information gathering (and) seeking input from you folks on what type of features might be incorporated with the project and specifically sounds like we're honing in on the bridges or the bridge. This particular bridge, Olohena Bridge. And so, perhaps at this point, if you want to

make a motion for a recommendation and then we can move through. If there is a design feature that you folks may want to suggest that they incorporate into the design going forward or whether it's come back with an archaeological survey so you folks can take another look at that and help you direct recommendation back to – on the project. So perhaps, that may be a way to move the discussion forward. It does sound like they're still in the information gathering phase, it would be appropriate at this time to make those types of suggestions.

Chair Wichman: Commissioners. Yes, Gerald.

Vice Chair Ida: So, the County owns this bridge.

Mr. Moule: Yes.

Vice Chair Ida: Did the County build this bridge.

Mr. Moule: It's hard to say. We don't have plans for it and we do have plans for the bridge in similar age that say County of Kaua'i construction. I think that it's likely this bridge was built by the County or was built by a sugar cane company or pineapple company and taken over by the County later. If I had to estimate, I'd say it's more likely not the County built the bridge, but I think it's also possible that a cane company built the bridge or similar company. It's based on my knowledge and other structures that we have in plans. I've seen other structures that are similar.

Vice Chair Ida: So, the construction of the new bridge will not affect the stone wing walls in any way.

Mr. Moule: That is my understanding.

Vice Chair Ida: Those walls, when I look at the photos (they are) pretty incredible.

Chair Wichman: Yes, they are.

Mr. Moule: Definitely.

Vice Chair Ida: Looks to me like typical of plantation construction with all the cut rock but I would very much like to see that survey report.

Ms. Summers: And clarification about whether the intentions is that those rock walls are maintained, not touched, not damaged, not moved.

Chair Wichman: So, at this point if we can make...oh go ahead Carolyn.

Ms. Larson: Isn't taking the concrete...

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Maybe speak in the mic, sorry. I know we're getting away from our mics.

Ms. Larson: Isn't taking the concrete part, I am sorry I don't know the terminology, but the top part that you drive on...

Mr. Guerber: The deck. The deck.

Ms. Larson: Isn't taking that off going to destabilize those walls.

Ms. Summers: Not necessarily.

Ms. Larson: Not necessarily, but possibly.

Mr. Guerber: Michael, it looked like there was a beam going across that's going to stay.

Mr. Moule: Let me show you. There's the image of the elevation view of the down stream and the bridge and you can see the walls with the bridge spanning. You know I think, that these are gravity walls that would stand up on their own, without this beam tied together. I think that – it's a little bit hard this is also the parapet that goes above the structure as well the old bridge. But, I think that that's – I don't think that taking them off would result in the walls just falling down, I think that they do just stand up on their own. And as you can see off the end of the structure the walls are standing on their own. In fact, if you look you can find an image showing a view. There's more wall off the bridge at least in this corner than there is under the bridge. There's a free standing ones, so I believe that the entire wall is...would free stand, sorry I guess the wall underneath is here, sorry I had that wrong. The wall is underneath here, the abutment portion of the wall...

Ms. Summers: And how much would remain visible. Where is it? Is it widening on the right hand side or the left.

Mr. Moule: Yes, the widening is on the, which way is up, I can't tell. Yes, on the widening, on this side so these two wing walls would be more visible than the ones. These would be mostly covered by the new structure. But these would be more visible without going under the bridge to see them. I can go back to the sheet, find the sheet that shows that best. This is the old structure here, the bridge itself is this parallelogram. These are the wing walls. These two wing walls would be mostly covered by the new structure. These two wing walls would stay in place and be visible pretty similar to where they are now that they'll be further down from the road structure, the road elevation than they are today because we're raising the bridge (a) fair amount on top of the old.

Ms. Summers: So, that does not look like its showing (that) the wing wall extends, that are shown...

Mr. Moule: The wall in the other picture.

Ms. Summers: Yes.

Mr. Moule: Yes, that's a good point. I don't know if that's just a drawing error on this part or not. This is from the plans. The other was from the inventory survey. This is from the archaeological inventory survey...

Ms. Summers: Yes, they look pretty different.

Mr. Moule: So, I don't know if they didn't finish this full wall in this image or what, but...

Mr. Guerber: Can you go back to the elevation.

Mr. Moule: Yes. The picture.

Mr. Guerber: There. With the new bridge on top.

Mr. Moule: Oh, you mean the design.

Mr. Guerber: Right, now.

Mr. Moule: Yes, right here. Upstream elevation, downstream. Down there, if I can get to it. There we go. This shows a longer wing wall I think than the last (*inaudible*).

Mr. Guerber: It looks to me like the old bridge is still underneath it and (has) not been removed at all.

Mr. Moule: Again, I am not clear on that. You know the design point of view.

Mr. Bautista: No, because remember the final design of the bridge has not been completed. We just proof it for them.

Mr. Moule: So yes, I don't know for sure, it maybe – we don't know for sure if it's entirely over the top of the structure and the whole thing will stay there or if the deck and the parapets have to go...

Mr. Guerber: Oh, I would recommend it stays there.

Mr. Moule: The entire thing.

Mr. Guerber: Yes.

Chair Wichman: Yes, I would like to ask, are these wing walls considered like retaining walls like for erosion. I mean was that their initial purpose or it was not just to hold up the bridge, right.

Mr. Guerber: No, it's for the streambed weed out erosion. The stream goes down so it wouldn't eat away the side of the bank.

Chair Wichman: Yes, erosion.

Mr. Moule: Yes, that's right. It's a dual purpose. Supports the abutment.

Ms. Larson: There's indications on the concrete the existing bridge that it's had damage from flooding.

Mr. Moule: You're looking at the pictures.

Ms. Larson: Yes.

Mr. Guerber: Yes, the bottom edge is chipped.

Mr. Moule: Here.

Mr. Guerber: There.

Ms. Larson: Yes. So evidently it floods.

Mr. Moule: That could be damage from flooding or could just be spalling that occurs from the concrete being old.

Ms. Larson: Okay.

Mr. Moule: But, I wouldn't be surprised if the water does get to this elevation at times. Although, I do know that Konohiki Stream is a much smaller drainage basin travel to it at this point than what's often called Kainahola Stream that we actually, we've been actually called Waikaea Stream. For the other Olohena bridge number one, the project that was recently replaced that gets a lot more water because it catches water from way up higher in the Wailua Homestead Kapaia Homestead general area. This stream is sort of between the Waikaea Stream and Kalama Stream, which is a tributary like Makaha Stream so it's catching a relatively small, small area so it doesn't carry as much water at this point then the other stream does. Waikaea Stream does where it crosses Olohena Road a couple miles from here.

Chair Whichman: Any more discussion.

Ms. Larson: I also have a basic question do we have any sense of what the community feels about the one lane bridge. Is there, do people want it small so that traffic is slower. Do people want it widened so that traffic is faster? Is that any part of this discussion?

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: I think that might be a separate process though, not necessarily through 106, but public outreach for the scope of the project.

Mr. Moule: Yes, we will do some public outreach for this project on that, at this time. Just based on other projects we get a mixed bag with respect to whether they want bridges to be one lane or two lanes. There are certainly people on both sides. I suspect...

Ms. Larson: I recommend that we...

Mr. Moule: That we would see more support for two lanes in this location than otherwise but we will definitely have people saying leave it as one lane. There will be some people probably minority but some people will say that.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Can we cap that sorry and come back to a discussion.

Chair Wichman: Any more discussion.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: So again, I think at this point what the applicant maybe looking for you know, is any input from this body on any methods or features that you folks feel is important to carry through the project. Whether it's – sounds like we're talking about the bridge, so any features that should be carried through on the look of the bridge. Any other archaeological type of issues to take into account. And again, it sounds as if they're in information gathering phase of the 106 process. Any input that you provide will be folded into the decisions that they have to incorporate in the project itself.

Chair Wichman: Yes, Steve.

Mr. Long: I believe I made my feelings really clear about the rock wall and exposed new structure and those feelings will also extend to the section profile of the parapet wall. If there was going to be a new parapet wall that that same section profile be carried throughout.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Perhaps yes, that could be incorporate as a motion.

Mr. Guerber: So do we craft a motion with recommendations.

Chair Wichman: We can.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Yes.

Mr. Guerber: Would you like to do that? I will do it. I move that we accept this project. We recommend this project with the following recommendations that we keep the walls, the rock walls (and) that you attempt to have the same profile of the sides that were there before...

Mr. Moule: The parapets.

Mr. Guerber: The parapets. Anything else to add.

Mr. Moule: As we said before I don't really think there would be much of the abutment exposed but if there is much of it exposed if you want to recommend that any exposed abutment of the bridge include a similar rock look I think that would be okay. I think (*inaudible*) to not be much exposed when done, but there might be a little bit at the top. That design hasn't been done yet.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Would you like to incorporate that sentiment in your motion.

Mr. Guerber: Yes, we got to craft the words. So we should add to it that if there's an opportunity...

Ms. Larson: Can I but in?

Mr. Guerber: Sure.

Ms. Larson: I think it's more than just...to me carrying on the character of this historic bridge is a little broader than the details that we're talking about. Carrying the design element of just the parapet rock work into something comparable. The character of the bridge is much more than that because it's a one lane bridge because it's minimalistic and going from what we see today to what we see in the proposal particularly with a long stretch of guardrail leading up to a much larger bridge plus the fact that it's a two lane bridge, so it'll be faster. I think there's questions there on what the community wants to see in that neighborhood. I don't pretend to know how bad the need is to have that be a faster road (and) to have it be a double lane bridge. I don't pretend to know what the community feels overall if there is one, if they swing one way or the other. Do we want...do we care about this bridge? Do we care that its one lane or do we hate it or love it? But in terms of keeping the historic character of the bridge I think there's other things that could be done in a new bridge that reflect that character and as I said carrying the stone work into some other element like part of the guardrails instead of just having the guardrails. I see you cringe.

Ms. Summers: Yes, sorry, because when I think of the north shore and like what Stephen was saying that kind of Disney Land stone, that's what I am picturing that would get carried through and to me then its not good, because then you have this absolutely beautiful cut stone work that's already there. So sometimes when you try to bring that into the new it kind of...

Ms. Larson: I understand God is in the details. Yes, so it's important that we see the phases, and see the details and we have answers to the questions of how much is exposed what could we actually do here. But I think in terms of a motion to move us forward if our motion could be little bit more broad to say that the character of that bridge be more evident in the design of the new bridge.

Mr. Guerber: So that would be our recommendation.

Ms. Summers: And you mean design as in the details or do you mean design as in the size (or) shape. I guess I am trying to understand what...

Ms. Larson: I mean both things, right now. Given I don't have any other information (on) the size of the bridge.

Ms. Summers: Okay, well we have drawings so we can look at that. We can scale them. We can get a pretty good sense of it is, I think. So then the question is are you...is it the historic sense of the size that you're trying to emulate. I guess I don't get it.

Ms. Larson: That's part of it.

Ms. Summers: Trying to understand.

Ms. Larson: And the character of the bridge is simplistic...

Ms. Summers: Very.

Ms. Larson: It has a – it's the guardrail. The effect of the guardrail has on the visual...

Ms. Summers: The guardrails on the side of the bridge or the guards to the side of the deck.

Ms. Larson: From what I looked at it's a basic concrete side to the bridge. I don't know how high that concrete is...

Ms. Summers: Forty-two inches per the drawings.

Ms. Larson: Forty-two inches is what you can see from the road. From the surface of the road.

Ms. Summers: Yes. And that's a code, that you know, obviously.

Ms. Larson: That's a current code. And what is the top? What is the edging on the top?

Mr. Moule: So right now – again we have not (gotten) final design on this bridge but the design...

Ms. Larson: Okay so...

Mr. Moule: Looks like a typical direct highway bridge...

Ms. Larson: It's just a...

Mr. Moule: But there's certainly potential for us to use something more decorative. There's limitations on that because it has to be (a) crash tested designs but if you wanted to recommend that we if possible...

Ms. Larson: Well the current bridge just has – it's just concrete but has a little lip on it. Right. It just goes up. Am I remembering that right?

Mr. Moule: *(Inaudible talked over Ms. Larson could not decipher)*

Ms. Summers: And I think that was part of the motion that we were crafting is that it should emulate that particular look.

Mr. Guerber: And I think that's the parapet. The guardrail is the metal pieces on the roadside leading to the bridge.

Ms. Larson: To the bridge. And how long are those.

Mr. Moule: Fifty feet.

Mr. Guerber: It looks pretty long.

Mr. Moule: Right now, the one that has that driveway is shorter. Its unattended anyway we're probably...we're going to either relocate that driveway and remove it and put in a 50 foot section there. So 50 feet each corner will be a metal guardrail, visually.

Ms. Larson: And the guardrail would go in regardless whether a new bridge is put in or the old bridge stays.

Mr. Moule: Well if we choose not to touch the bridge as part of this project, we won't touch it at all. We'll just leave it alone and deal with it in another project.

Ms. Larson: So you would pave up to a certain point...

Mr. Moule: Yes, we would just stop paving at the bridge.

Ms. Larson: And no new guardrails for safety.

Mr. Moule: Because that would require going through a similar process.

Ms. Larson: Got it.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: So we do have a motion on the floor. It didn't carry forward, so it failed. I didn't hear a second.

Mr. Guerber: No seconds.

Ms. Summers: I am not clear on the end of the motion, sorry.

Ms. Larson: Can you try your motion again.

Mr. Guerber: I can try. I move that we...I move to recommend the project with the following restrictions; that we retain the wing walls and the cut stone and as much of the old bridge as possible underneath the new bridge and that the new parapets emulate the parapets on the old bridge as much as possible. That's it.

Chair Wichman: Do I hear a second.

Ms. Summers: I second.

Chair Wichman: Discussion. Hearing no discussion and come to a vote so, all in favor. (Partial voice vote). Any opposed.

Ms. Larson: Opposed.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Okay. Motion carried.

Chair Wichman: Motion carries. Thank you. Motion carried 5:1.

J. NEW BUSINESS

1. Kaumakani School (Kamehameha Schools)

Exterior and interior building renovations include in-kind replacement of existing materials that have been damaged either by wood rot or termite, removal of hazardous materials (i.e. Canec and lead paint), renovation of restrooms to meet ADA compliance, construction of new stairs and landing, construction of a new CMU wall structure, ADA ramp and parking stalls, and grading along with a concrete swale to mitigate for erosion.

TMK: (4) 1-7-006:008

a. Director's Report pertaining to this matter.

Commissioners received a 13-page (A01,A02,A03,A04,A05,A07,A08,A09,A10,A12,A13,A14,A15) set of renovation plans/drawings by YFH Architects, Inc. dated 4/30/20.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: We do have a representative from the applicant here.

Historic Planner Alex Wong: Do I read my directors report?

Chair Wichman: Aloha, thank you.

Unidentified Speaker: Want to thank Chairperson Wichman and Planning Director Sayegusa for having me here today. I want to thank Alex and Ka'āina for putting me on the agenda, as I've waited for couple of months, actually.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: What was your name, sorry.

YFH Architects, Inc. Project Architect Lance Kaneshiro: My name is Lance Kaneshiro. I am with YFH Architects. I am here to present to you our proposal to the renovation at the Kaumakani preschool. I just wanted to go over some historical background about this building and then I'll continue on to describe what our proposal for this renovation would be. So, this Kaumakani preschool is located at 2301 Kaumakani Road. It sits on about 7.5 acre parcel the building itself, the preschool, is about 12,500 square feet. There's also a community center on that same parcel as well. This parcel is owned by the Robinson family and it was constructed in 1922. And first started out being Makaweli school and then...this school was generally used for the education of the plantation families until 1986 where – from 1986, to present there's a various number of agencies that, you know, took over the place and used it for educational

purposes. But now, it is run by KS (Kamehameha Schools) and it's a preschool, I mean Kamehameha Schools.

This building was designed by John (Keanu) Waiamau, he was born in Honolulu (and) he is a graduate of the first Kamehameha class, school class. He was a drafts person under, lets see, C.B. Ripley and then he went on to Chicago to go to drafting school where he later returned to Līhu'e (and) became the County Engineer, Deputy Assistant Engineer and he designed this building.

The building is...as the existing building right now is of a asphalt shingle roof. The exterior siding is 5-1/4 inch vertical planks with O. G. batten. The battens are like a half inch, quarter half inch round, well the O. G. itself is about an inch wide. The center part of the O. G. is a half round with 2/4 circles on each side and the foundation is of concrete block. It's a single wall constructed, tongue and groove siding. The roofing is probably the only thing that really changed with being asphalt. I am not sure as to what the original material was before but according to historical records that was the major change to this building.

So what we propose is that...the roofing was actually redone several years ago I mean in terms of replacing the roof so,as part of this project we're not touching that part of it at all. What we're planning to do is repair all the siding wherever there's major damage to it by either like wood rot or termite damage. Replace the boards, the siding, the O. G. battens. We will replace some of the structural elements that define the character of the building. They have like two double posted columns where they hold up the lanai and do some exterior work as well, site work as well, and interior work. So can I show you what our proposal is.

(Mr. Kaneshiro left speaker table and walked over to map displayed on corkboard)

Mr. Kaneshiro: So, exterior work...

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Oh sorry, let me pull the mic (microphone). Talk into the mic.

Mr. Kaneshiro: For the exterior site work. Right now there's a big empty field in the back of the building. And what's happening is that the run off is driving the sediment under the building. So where the dirt is now it's up and beyond the height of the footings which is touching, you know the major post structure elements as well as the skirting that goes below the floor line and is causing wood rot and damage. So what we're proposing is to actually, one of the proposals is to actually construct the CMU (Concrete Masonry Units) wall along the whole side of the back so that as the run off continues it doesn't go under the building, which is what we're trying to avoid. But we also (are) providing a concrete swell that will swell around the building so that the water doesn't accumulate...the water doesn't drive the dirt under the structure.

We're also constructing two surface ADA (American's with Disability Act) stalls, as well as redoing the ramp right now to meet compliance with ADA. I think that is it for the site work. Right now, the people just park around...there's no parking lot per say. But, the teachers just park on site. So this is the floor plan. What we're planning to do is repair wherever there's damage to the lanai areas (and) replace one and one. The whole project is to replace as much as

we can, one on one, like in kind. So, if it's a plank siding, a plank decking, or whatever, we replace it with the same. So, we're planning to redo some areas in the lanai areas. We will add two restrooms. Right now there's four classrooms. Two of them have...so right now two of the classrooms have restrooms and what we're going to do is add...so actually two of the – there's four classrooms. There's four classrooms, one, two, three, four. Two of them already have restrooms in them. We're going to add two restrooms, in the other two, that doesn't have. That is probably the most biggest thing that we're adding to this building in terms of infrastructure, and whatever have you. We are replacing all the lightings to LED's (Light Emitting Diode). We're upgrading fire alarm systems. We are repainting the whole exterior. We're replacing some of the doors because some of the doors currently are the five panel doors and some of them are, you know they replaced them with solid core flushed doors. We're going to replace them to reflect that five, original five panel door. We're changing the hardware to comply with the ADA, as well as fire exiting for the classrooms. We are removing all of the canec material that is in there, lead paint, and we're repainting all the interiors, exteriors, and redoing all the lanai work around the – ceiling the lanai's as well.

The biggest thing is that we are, we're out for bid right now and we're getting another cost. Our intent is to replace one for one and the drawings, as being permitted is to replace or repair the existing windows, but as we're getting numbers in and budget might be the driving factor, but we're thinking about replacing all of the windows. I don't know what you're concerned about that, as a board. How do you guys...that's my question to you guys. Is how do you feel if we replace all of the windows in cladding versus they're all wood right now. But, the inside would be retained as wood, but the outside would be aluminum cladding.

Ms. Summers: And so it still looks...

Mr. Kaneshiro: Yes, looks like that has the (*inaudible*) yes that we'll paint all the colors to the existing building colors right now. The look is you know just – it's going to look the same but just the material change.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: So perhaps, we can just (go) through the presentation. And I apologize. Typically we've been handing it to the staff planner who could give a brief overview of our analysis and evaluation of the project and then we can go back to the applicant for fine tuning and any recommendations.

Mr. Kaneshiro: So this is the courtyard elevation. This is looking at it this way. We not changing anything. We're just replacing all the damaged items which would include even the ceilings, interior and exterior in the lanai areas. Like I said, we're replacing all these double columns, wherever there's damage. Just basically repairing whatever is damaged and putting...

Mr. Guerber: So you're restoring it.

Mr. Kaneshiro: We're restoring it, yes. We're also replacing all the slat areas where there's been wood or termite damage, as well as the access doors under. Two (access doors) under the building. There's also exterior seating along the lanai area, wherever there's damage, we're replacing, as well. So, basically replacement of one-for-one. So, just some of the pictures that

depict how worn this building has been. Sorry, the color, I don't know, it's not the color, we're not touching the roof.

Mr. Guerber: Is this being used, right now.

Mr. Kaneshiro: Yes, this is currently in use.

Mr. Guerber: And it says it's just a preschool.

Mr. Kaneshiro: Preschool, yes.

Mr. Guerber: So, no other classes beside the preschool.

Mr. Kaneshiro: Yes. So, what we're planning to do is just repaint everything as is one-for-one (with) the color, try to match as best as we can. And replacing all these slat works under the building that – pretty much all around the whole perimeter. There's damage where the dirt has, you know accumulated where its touching some of the slat work.

Mr. Guerber: And you're going to drag the dirt out from under.

Mr. Kaneshiro: Yes. And so, what we're planning to do is extend the excavation work under the building to just take the dirt away from the footings, you know the interior footings, as well. So, over here you can see that the dirt, I don't know if you can see clearly on this picture but what's happening is the hill behind the dirt is running down and then it's like accumulating all after the foot print of the building, as well as its running under the slab work.

Mr. Guerber: You're going to replace – you're going to put a CMU wall on the back.

Mr. Kaneshiro: That's one of the proposals.

Mr. Guerber: How tall.

Ms. Summers: And how far.

Mr. Kaneshiro: Oh no, we're replacing the footings, yes, and creating the CMU wall under the footprint of the building. Just on this side.

Mr. Guerber: That's like where the footings would be.

Mr. Kaneshiro: Yes.

Ms. Summers: So the slats would cover the CMU.

Mr. Kaneshiro: Yes.

Ms. Summers: Okay. So, you wouldn't even see the CMU.

Mr. Kaneshiro: Maybe a little bit in-between the slats because the slats don't...because they're spaced apart a little.

Ms. Larson: You're talking about the CMU wall, right.

Mr. Kaneshiro: Oh, yes, sorry.

Ms. Larson: The CMU wall would be right up against the wood of the building.

Mr. Kaneshiro: No, under the floor line of the building.

Mr. Guerber: The CMU wall would replace the footings.

Ms. Larson: And then it would be hidden...

Mr. Kaneshiro: Behind these slat works. So, behind.

Ms. Summers: So, it would be behind those and then they replace all that. Instead of the current footings, they'll be a wall, a solid wall.

Mr. Kaneshiro: Yes.

Ms. Summers: And then they'd put the wood back...

Mr. Kaneshiro: Yes.

Ms. Summers: So it would...

Mr. Kaneshiro: So it still retains the character of the building.

Ms. Summers: So you'd still...

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Sorry, could you folks talk into the mics, (on) any discussion there.

Ms. Summers: So, you'd still see the wood.

Mr. Kaneshiro: So yes, the slats would still remain so that the character of the building is still in tact throughout the whole exterior.

Ms. Summers: And could paint it, black or something.

Mr. Kaneshiro: CMU wall, yes.

Ms. Summers: Waterproofing or something.

Mr. Kaneshiro: Yes.

Chair Wichman: I have a question for you. Does this school – was...well not developed until the '20's, but that land is a lot older than that. So do they know what was there before that school was put there.

Mr. Kaneshiro: Well, in the 1880's, according to what I've read, there was development (that) started in 1889. And originally I think there was four structures on the building, but this is the only one that's remaining (of) the original four structures.

Chair Wichman: Okay, this school was established in 1889.

Mr. Kaneshiro: Well, the development of this I believe (this) area started in 1889, but this school was built in 1922.

Chair Wichman: The western development of this school.

Mr. Kaneshiro: Yes.

Chair Wichman: So it doesn't mean the Hawaiian – what was going on before the school was there. That's what I am curious about. Because it's Makaweli, I mean it's a really, really important place in Hawaiian history. And Robinson land and it's just in those days people just built whatever they wanted to and so I am just kind of curious if anybody's interested or if anybody knows what was there before or if anything was there before.

Mr. Kaneshiro: Well I know...I am not sure what was there before. I can find out.

Chair Wichman: Well, I just had a question because I've come up with a similar situation where we restored a house but we found underneath the house when we pulled up the floor there was an original Hawaiian house site underneath that.

Mr. Kaneshiro: Wow.

Chair Wichman: So, that's why I am asking those questions because a lot of things were built on old Hawaiian house sites. So I am curious and you have all these run offs underneath the building but there could very well be a lot of archaeological, a lot of Hawaiian things underneath the building. We don't know that.

Mr. Kaneshiro: That's true. And we would follow SHPD's rules. Where if you dig and you encounter whatever have you, artifacts, construction would need to be stopped.

Chair Wichman: Of course. But is there a plan for that.

Mr. Kaneshiro: We haven't gone to SHPD yet. I wanted to present this to you folks first.

Chair Wichman: Right, right. Okay, thank you.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Perhaps it might be a good opportunity to segway to our planners presentation...real briefly summarizing his directors report and any recommendations and then of course we can come back to ask detailed questions with the applicant. Okay, sorry. Perhaps you can sit down and...

Mr. Kaneshiro: Oh, okay.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Thank you.

Chair Wichman: Thank you Alex.

Mr. Wong: Aloha, Alex Wong for the record.

Mr. Wong read the Director's Report for TMK: (4) 1-7-006:008 dated February 20, 2020, for the record. *(10 page Document on file)*

Deviated from the Director's Report and inserted his comments at Criteria D. page 5.

Mr. Wong: Originally, I asserted that this property most likely does not meet National Register Criteria D.; however, as brought up by Chairperson Wichman, there is potential that there might be archaeological finds beneath the existing structure and that has yet to be uncovered in terms of my digging in planning department records. So there is a potential there. But based on the information that I had access to at the time, I did not see any reference to archaeological sites. But, that does not mean that there are not files in Kapolei in SHPD's office with additional archaeological data. So, that would be in the realm of David Buckley, SHPD archaeologist. But in conclusion, for the criteria, it does meet multiple criteria and like I said before it is ripe for consideration for historic structure.

Mr. Wong continued to read the Director's Report for TMK: (4) 1-7-006:008 dated February 20, 2020, for the record. *(10 page Document on file)*

Mr. Wong: I did have one additional comment that I'd like to pose to the applicant. And that is in addition to the CMU wall meant for mitigating for erosion, soil erosion. I was wondering if you have considered also landscaping and using perhaps vetiver grass or any sort of native shrubbery, or hedge, or plants, to also, mitigate for top soil erosion.

Mr. Kaneshiro: Yes, for the upside of the exposed areas that is causing the erosion. We've considered doing some landscaping.

Mr. Wong: Mahalo. That concludes my report for this project.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Are there any questions.

Chair Wichman: Any questions. Yes, Stephen.

Mr. Long: I have a couple of questions. One, I see that you note that you are cutting slats and repairing slats and there appears to be an existing screening that screens the crawl space.

Mr. Kaneshiro: Like metal screens.

Mr. Long: No.

Ms. Summers: The wood stuff.

Mr. Long: Yes, the wood stuff vertical wood screen. So does the new CMU wall being constructed behind that existing wood screen, is (it) being repaired.

Mr. Kaneshiro: Yes.

Mr. Long: Okay, that was one question. The other question had to do with, I understood you said you're replacing the wood double hung windows.

Mr. Kaneshiro: Well that is what we're – right now as we're permitting the project, that is what the intent is to repair and or replace certain elements of the existing windows. But that is one question as I stated before that I pose to you, the committee, whether or not placement of the window with clad, aluminum clad windows, wood on the inside (and) aluminum on the outside would be an alternative to replacing it. Because the thought behind that, was that if you replace some of them, we're not going to retain the whole consistent look throughout the...

Ms. Summers: Does that meet the U.S. Secretary of Interior Standards. Alex, replacement of the windows.

Mr. Wong: Sorry, one more time.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Could you talk into the mic, sorry.

Mr. Wong: Yes, so typically the planning department's stance in terms of, like for like substitution of original materials, is that as long as the applicant does to their best ability and with their feasible budget that they find something that is the next best option in terms of roofing materials, window materials. Typically planning department does go back and forth with the applicant prior to permit approval or following permit approval (but) before actual construction in terms of okaying and signing off on the proposed materials. So, we will maintain an open communication channel with the applicant during the construction process and permitting process.

Mr. Kaneshiro: So our proposal – well as I stated before permitting we're replacing one-for-one or repairing one-for-one. But on the back end, we're considering replacing all of the windows so that they maintain a consistent look and then for budgetary and longevity of the window, lower maintenance for those reasons.

Chair Wichman: Stephen.

Mr. Long: Yes, I appreciate the owner's philosophy on replacing like kind with like kind and particularly in the materials and the detailing. Now, those double hung windows have been there since 1922.

Mr. Kaneshiro: Yes.

Mr. Long: So they've been there for awhile. And I know how sensitive Kamehameha Schools is in furthering the educational experience and the schools that they operate. And that the original double hung windows would be something that they would want to replace in kind with like kind, just as they are the other architectural historical details.

Mr. Kaneshiro: To replace like in kind.

Mr. Long: And I have one other comment about the concrete swell and a new CMU wall. That's going to require a new footing, you know probably continuance footing below the building. And picking up on Commissioner Wichman's and Ida's concerns and experience. If you're going to be...my comment is, if you're going to be disturbing that soil anyway with a swell and a continuance footing for new CMU wall...yes, I understand about exposing any architectural remains and historical elements (that) you would notify the building inspector and stop work immediately. Yet in this instance, and because its Makaweli, is it advised to do an archaeological survey as part of disturbing that land. That's just a question (or) comment not a proposal. Because I am not the archaeologist.

Mr. Kaneshiro: Well that can be done and like I said we haven't gone to SHPD yet. The proposal that we have with permitting that wall is an extreme case, as its looking like now the budget will probably not support that because that's quite extensive work to do. So more than likely we (are) not going to attempt to do that and just retain and scrape and put the concrete swell around the backside of the building to mitigate the erosion. You know, control issues.

Chair Ida: You know I totally appreciate where you're going with this. But, besides what the Chairman said about, you know the whole example about the house site being under the building and stuff like that. You know there's also, what are we talking 80 plus years of that area being used as a school. There might be a lot of historical archaeology in that place. But the thing is too, I know you're always concerned about costs but because your plans are so detailed already and you know exactly where the stuff is going to go, you know, you might be able to get away with (it). In terms of, you know either monitoring or just digging up areas, (you) know that are going to be disturbed.

Mr. Kaneshiro: That is the first thought and intention was to do that...go and do as a monitoring situation. So that has been in the thought process of all this. But, like I said when the numbers are starting to add up it doesn't seem that the project could support the CMU wall anyway. So going to plan b was just adding in the concrete swell to mitigate the erosion control issue.

Chair Ida: And because if what you stated is true, and I not doubting you or anything, if a lot of material is swept under the building, I can imagine what kind of stuff might be in there that dates from the use of the site as a school.

Mr. Kaneshiro: We will look into that. Thank you.

Chair Wichman: Any other questions.

Ms. Larson: Yes.

Chair Wichman: Yes, Carolyn.

Ms. Larson: Did I understand correctly that you're putting in restrooms to classrooms that currently don't have them.

Mr. Kaneshiro: Yes.

Ms. Larson: And they would be like the restrooms in the other classrooms.

Mr. Kaneshiro: Yes. The same format is being followed.

Ms. Larson: And then in addition you're putting ADA restrooms, as a separate structure.

Mr. Kaneshiro: Well, no. The restrooms being added, will be ADA compliant. We're not renovating the existing restrooms right now. Only there's a – so these are the kids restrooms and we're not touching these. We're adding a restroom here and I think was in this one. The restrooms we're renovating would be these two, which are for the staff members, which are not ADA compliant right now. So we're going to renovate to meet that.

Ms. Larson: And the Department of Interior Standards deal with upgrading restrooms?

Mr. Wong: Yes, it is acceptable under Secretary of Interior Standards to bring things up to modern day code, including ADA accessibility. Including ramps, pathways, restrooms, etcetera.

Chair Wichman: Any other questions.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Well similar to the previous discussion we had about 106 this is a project in, I think, a preplanning phase. And so, if there's any suggestions or recommendations from you folks that the applicant should incorporate in their final designs, I think this is the reason for them being here, before you folks, so yes.

Mr. Kaneshiro: Well we have the opportunity to change things because we're in the permitting process right now. So, you guys can make comments to those things.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Yes...

Mr. Wong: Yes, planning department can make comments but that at this time this is the opportunity for the historic commission to propose any conditions to the permit or specific request for architectural styles that should be addressed.

Chair Wichman: So, do we have any motions.

Mr. Long: I move that we accept the project as presented. I have a question. Will this come before us again? Or, is this the last time it comes before us.

Mr. Wong: This would potentially be the last time.

Mr. Long: Okay, so I move that we accept this project as presented. With the caveat that we support the replacing kind for like kind architectural elements in the building including the wood double hung windows and that archaeological monitoring be done with any subsoil disturbance.

Ms. Summers: I second that.

Mr. Guerber: I second that.

Chair Wichman: We second. Any discussion. (Hearing none). Okay, all in favor. (Unanimous voice vote). Any opposed. (Hearing none). Okay, so moved. Motion carried 6:0.

Mr. Kaneshiro: Thank you.

2. Class IV Zoning Permit Z-IV-2020-9 to develop a mixed-use commercial/multi-family residential project containing spaces for retail, office, restaurant operations, 62 residential units and associated site improvements on a parcel situated within the Līhu‘e Town core area on the corner of Rice Street and Umi Street, further identified as 3016 Umi Street, Tax Map Key: 3-6-003:010, and containing a total area of 1.5313 acres = RBM UMI, LLC.

a. Director’s Report pertaining to this matter.

Ms. Larson: Chair Wichman.

Chair Wichman: Yes.

Ms. Larson: I have a potential conflict on this item. My husband is working with the owner and has worked on, so I’d like to recuse myself.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: I think typically if you...we would ask that you go outside the room, sorry, yes.

Chair Wichman: Thank you for disclosing that.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: We can come back, I’ll come get you once we’re done. You can have a seat in our office and then we’ll come and get you.

Ms. Summers: I hate to ask – can I have a one-minute break or two-minute break?

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Yes.

Chair Wichman: It's a 4:49 or 4:59.

Mr. Guerber: 4:59.

Chair Wichman: We'll have a short break.

Commission Larson recused herself and left the meeting room at 4:59 p.m.

Chair Wichman called for a recess at 4:59 p.m.

Chair Wichman reconvened the meeting at 5:09 p.m.

Commissioner's received a two page colored rendering of the project, Exhibit "E".

Chair Wichman: Okay, meeting resumed at 5:09 p.m., yikes.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: We do have a representative from the applicant here, yes.

Belles Graham LLP Attorney Ian Jung: Good afternoon Chair Wichman and members of the commission. This is Ian Jung on behalf of the applicant RBM Umi LLC.

Chair Wichman: Do you have a presentation.

Mr. Jung: I have a presentation to give right now, but it seems like the report...

Chair Wichman: Oh, that's right, Alex you can go first.

Mr. Jung: So I can jump in after that, fill the gaps.

Mr. Wong read the Director's Report for TMK: (4) 3-6-003:010 dated February 20, 2020, for the record. *(7 page Document on file)*

Chair Wichman: Thank you Alex.

Mr. Jung: Okay, yes again. Good afternoon, sometimes I have to apologize for being an attorney because we look very closely at what the definitions saying. The only reference I was going to make to the directors report was if you look at HRS 6E-2 the definition of historic property is over 50 years old, so I would trigger that at 51 years and over. So, when I first got this project that's the first thing I looked at because we have to identify what are we going to do to manage the historical integrity of the building, if we do decide to demo it. So that's one thing we will take up with SHPD, you know if it gets that far to address whether or not it is historic and if they do require (a) HABS (Historic American Building Survey) study to go through the whole protocol (of) producing the HABS report. But with that said, it is on the fringe of the Civic Center historic district and it is in what the Lihue Town Core Urban Design Plan calls a

historic district. So, comments by this body I think are appropriate and we can certainly work through it to get a feel on what you think the project from an appearance stand point would be.

Because I think as we all recognize, you know when people build it, people do come. And with the new upgrades to the Līhu'e Town Core plan and with the increase in density and the encouragement to do mixed use affordable housing, this is an opportune time for a project like this to come in and set the stone as a catalyst project for future projects. So, getting comments as to the design of how it should be set and look, I think is an important facet of getting this project approved. And just to go on that, it is proposed to be a full affordable housing project. We are going to be applying. We acknowledge and thank the planning department in getting this in. But we started this application process in December, which is a relatively fast track process given a scale of this project because we want to try and target in getting an approval by the county so we can get support under the LIHTC (The Low-Income Housing Tax Credit) application which is a Federal affordable housing tax credit program. So, if we get support from the planning department and the planning commission then we can use that leverage for our application to qualify this project for affordable funding from the feds (Federal) to get this project up and running.

With that said, it is 62 units, as noted by the planner. It's split with 38 units of one-bedroom and 24 units of two-bedroom set as an apartment based. There's going to be three floors of these apartment units in that mix of one and two bedroom apartments and then below those three floors of units is the commercial component, which is the strong encouragement for the new Rice Street corridor. The application that is pending is actually only a Class IV Zoning Permit, which is unusual but it is just a Class IV (Zoning Permit) it's a procedural permit only by the fact that it's a project of 51 or more units. So, we have to go before the planning commission to get their stamp of approval just for the density count. With regard to the design features...are the owner and let me just layout how its working here.

The owner is actually Kaua'i Development Associates (Inc.). My client RBM Umi LLC is in escrow to purchase the property contingent on securing these permits. If the permits are secured then we'll move forward with the project. The way its setup in the Līhu'e Town Core plan is you have a regulating plan outside of the normal context of the CZO so our Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance (CZO) has its own protocol for design requirements. But we have an extra layer that supersedes the CZO and look at how we're going to implement specific design guidelines for this Rice Street corridor. And the way I setup the application is because it was on this kind of fast track process is that we would solicit comments from this body and the planning commission and then reserve for the planning department who has the expertise in drafting the Rice Street design guidelines, their final call on the final design. So, the owner, my client, has secured Mason Architects (Inc.) to be the design. They came up with these two iterations. And what I submitted in the original package that you have is actually on the second page of the enlarged sheet. That was the original proposal and from a design standpoint they used sort of a lap siding and they used these columns to break up the massing and it kind of had that front gable roof and the planning department didn't like that look. It kind of looked, kind of like a hospital or in some words a jail. So, we had Mason Architects do another rendering and that's on the top sheet. That kind of did the – kind of took into consideration the roof lines recommended in the Līhu'e Town Core Plan 5.1.4.5 (Roofs) and did the front gable in kind of a

split and then did articulating segments of the massing where you have the horizontal siding, then intermixed with sort of a bump out of mortared plastered siding. And so, we tried – the issue was massing and how we’re going to kind of mask the appearance of a structure. I think everyone’s okay with the lower floor, where you have the retail on the bottom with the roof line. And then the setback of the apartment area, setback 15 feet, to kind of give it that setback approach, so it’s not one big mass. But I think what needs work and we’re willing to work with this body, as well as the planning commission and the planning department, (is) on how to make the massing feature work to kind of set the tenor of what the future Rice Street design will be.

Now Rice Street is complicated, because you have a mish mash of architectural styles. And I am a lawyer, I am not an architect, but I’ll leave it to the architects in the room to address it. But you have the sort of the classical revival on the old county historic building. Then you have mission revival for the old courthouse building in the back. And then you have kind of a mix along down the street where my building is, you know it’s the Watumull Plaza that’s really unique and modern, and then you have stretching down, the Kress building, beyond the two other buildings, that are more modern. The Kress building and then that stretch kind of like that midcentury modern look. So we’re open to concepts of what type of style and to hide or mask the massing of the building. One comment we received thus far from the community is looking at doing patio’s, which might give a more articulating reference to how it’s going to appear. But, I am happy to answer any questions from a historic standpoint, you know just when we met with Pat Griffin or our consultant Pat Griffin, we kind of get a historical context of it.

Apparently, the property was developed in 1927, with a single-family residence with some garage and storing units. On that property lived someone of historic nature was Frank Crawford, who was the postmaster for the Līhu‘e Post Office and then also the First Bank of Hawai‘i. So we discussed with Pat or Ms. Griffin to do some kind of plaque or reference, historical reference on the area to kind of reference who lived there on the property. Following that structure being demo’d (demolished) what we’ve come to realize based on an analysis of maps between 1965 and 1972, that single family residence was taken down and then this structure went up in 1970, or got permitted in 1970, we just don’t know when it was finally set on property to be the quote, unquote historic structure. But, there was another restaurant building, some of you may recall it was on the northern portion of the property that was demo’d sometime in 1988, and used as the restaurant facility. The structure itself as it currently sits, that’s slated to be demo’d, is not conforming to what the Līhu‘e Town Core plan envisioned. We worked with our architects to try and make this area, or this project conform to those guidelines. And it’s not just the building look, it’s also the street scape.

So, if you look in your packet, I didn’t distribute this in a large set but on Exhibit E, we have some parking in the front and we’ve had a meeting with Central Pacific Bank to identify how we’re going to accommodate their reentry back in the building once it’s completed. So, we had a requirement in the Rice Street design guideline to do these parking in the front which will be dedicated to the county. So, if you see there on the Umi Street side, we’ll have some additional parking in there. I just was talking with Michael Moule county engineering branch chief and he wants the reverse in parking area similar to what you have up here in front of the county building. So, there’s a lot to this project. It is a great project to bring into the Rice Street corridor (and) to kind of follow through on the improvements that are happening under the

TIGER (Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery) grant and the vision that was set forth in the regional town plan. But, again, you know it is complicated to try and make it match the historical context of the area, given there's such a mix of architectural styles. So, we're open to feedback from you folks as to what you think would be good architectural components or motifs to this project that we can make work. So it sets (the) tenor, the next project down the street, if one ever does come. So, with that I'll answer any questions. If you guys have any questions.

Chair Wichman: Questions from the commissioners.

Mr. Long: I have a thought. And that is the TIGER grant, Līhu'e Rice Street is meant to be much more pedestrian experiential (and) inner city development, and so I am wondering if there's any, you know opportunity for a push and pull with the elevations. So that you have an area upside that people could go to, or a small exterior lanai that they could look out the window and experience the street below. Just a thought.

Mr. Jung: Yes, so we got that comment as well, and one of the comments was that along Umi Street side, you know when the Christmas lights, light up on the county building it would be pretty phenomenal to be on that Umi Street side sitting on your porch looking at those, you know during the month of December. So it's something we will factor in, you know obviously it is an affordable housing project, but so there are costs that are involved but the architect and the owner is willing to look into that.

Mr. Long: You know, well I believe that, you know lower income people also like to experience the outside and have lanai's. I see that there is some kind of core there on the right elevation it looks like it maybe some kind of bridge or a exterior area that you walk between the two columns. And that looks like an opportunity for that to happen there. I am just wondering if there's an opportunity in each of the individual units for that to also occur.

Mr. Jung: Okay.

Mr. Long: People just like being on the street. There's going to be a lot of activity on Rice Street, and you open up your windows and there's a garden, a railing, you can...it doesn't have to be that wide.

Mr. Jung: Sure.

Chair Wichman: Any other comments or questions, Commissioners. Aubrey.

Ms. Summers: I am trying to understand where they. Are they trying to pick up, on any particular...I mean it doesn't feel mid-centry, doesn't feel like it emulates the courthouse, or the...I mean it feels like its own new thing. Some...

Mr. Jung: Yes, well the architect quoted for me the...if you look at it, you know it's hard...I think what he worked on, this particular architect worked on the county building, the historic county building. So I think, there's a feature there on the first iteration where you have these

columns that kind of look, kind of like that classical revival with a slight art deco, but the massing is hard to breach there, right. So the idea I think, is to create this new model or mode of architecture where you have sort of like a, trying to think of the best word here, but it's a mix of what you have on Kress building with the concrete and with what the county building is.

Ms. Summers: Yes.

Mr. Jung: But it doesn't fit the category, a general historical category, from an architectural style that I've seen. And that's why I think it's critical to have this final design review by the planning department so we can have these guys weight in exactly how it'll look. Because I think this will be our community in setting the tone of what is going to be there (and) I think (that) will help push what other buildings will look like in the future, as you stretch down the road on Rice Street. Because with Council allowing for R40 our highest density zone now in this particular area, people are going to start maximizing the 54 height limitation, right. And then going into a maximum density on whatever lot size they have. So the mixed use component will probably be something of the near future as new projects come in.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Yes, so if there's any suggestions I think, yes that would be very important for the department ultimately considering a final review, so.

Chair Wichman: Commissioner Guerber.

Mr. Guerber: There's a development in Los Angeles that's called Playa Vista where all the tech (Technology) companies are moving in. And its building kind of like this, except they all have balconies and there's plants on the balconies. And it really looks much better than this. To me this, even the second iteration just looks way to blocky. It's not appealing to me. But on the other hand we see in other places that you put a new thing in there that originally doesn't look so good but it defines the neighborhood, the look. And it becomes that part of it and becomes very attractive. So we all have to change our minds too perhaps. But I do believe, look at the kind of architecture that's in a place called Playa Vista.

Mr. Jung: Okay. That's in L.A. (Los Angeles, CA)

Mr. Guerber: Near Playa Del Ray.

Mr. Jung: Playa Del Ray.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Eventually we can get to a point again of a recommendation for the applicant to take back, yes.

Chair Wichman: It's just my personal opinion. I am allowed to say that right. And it just seems really out of place. Like really out of place. You got the county building over here. You got the old police, well the police buildings gone now but just – I understand what you're trying to do here and in bringing more opportunity for our Rice Street, you know for the revitalization project and for the TIGER grant and all that. It just seems really out of place. It's just – we have all this old historic, you know buildings and even this building is historic and it's just, right there.

It just doesn't make sense to me. You cross the street (and it) is different buildings that kind of blend in to the old buildings. It's just my personal opinion and that's really not our personal opinions aren't...

Mr. Guerber: They're fine.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Are relevant, yes

Chair Wichman: They are?

Mr. Guerber: Yes.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Yes.

Mr. Long: On an architectural basis and I don't really feel it's our responsibility to do any design as a commissioner on the commission. But I do know that Mason Architects is a very highly respected Honolulu architectural firm and they do primarily historical renovations restorations architecture. And when I look at this rendering, I am surprised it was done by Mason Architects particularly the first one, because its lacking in what you know Chairman Wichman referred to as architectural historical elements found around the (*inaudible*). It's not really as much to say, well the Kress Buildings concrete so we have concrete here. I am you know, the concrete at the Kress Building is actually really gorgeous beautiful. Its been sand blasted, it has a texture to it, much like the historical walls in Mexican and South American villages where the stucco is textured in a certain way. So I guess I was surprised that Mason Architect is responsible for this rendering and I would like to see more architectural historical references, materials, construction methodology and wouldn't be that difficult to do. Its just not, I don't know, that's my comment.

Mr. Guerber: So Ian, could you...there's a deadline involved here, tell me about that.

Mr. Jung: Yes, so the deadline that we're looking at is we have to get a full package, full approval by April so we can get the package up to HHFDC (Hawai'i Housing Finance and Development Corporation) which is the Hawai'i Housing Development Corporation which then facilitates the LIHTC application which is the Low Income Affordable Housing Tax Credit. They allocate a certain number of unit project counts and I forget its called like the allocation plan or something like that. So it goes in the running with other projects in the area and the planning commission just approved another project up near the movie theatre in Kukui Grove. I think that one was a 54 unit affordable housing project. The design was somewhat similar to this, but obviously it's outside of the historic corridor where Rice Street (is) so it doesn't have the scrutiny that this project has. But projects like that go into the hopper of when they make a decision to allocate what units get approved for affordable housing. If the LIHTC application is denied, then we'll reapply for (it) the next year. But if the project gets built then it'll still be subject to the county's affordable housing ordinance which is 30% affordable. So, the target is to try and get the approval before the April deadline so the application can go in and we can get in a competitive model for the allocation of units.

And then, if its approved, we've already proffered to the planning department let's do a design guideline review with the planning department so we can make sure the project, the overall project is compatible with the Rice Street design guideline. And normally if we stayed under 50 units we wouldn't even need planning commission approval we could just go forward, but just to get that extra 12 unit count provide a little more housing we went through and got the maximized amount that's allowed under the R40 zoning now. We could even go more now that they've passed a R40 with ARU's which is an additional rental unit. So theoretically, we could go R80 to capitalize on that one additional 800 square foot extra unit, which is accessory to the additional unit to get more inventory there. But the problem we face was the parking, right. So with the building on street frontage on Umi and then on Rice Street we needed to allocate parking on the back so we could have parking for, not only for the commercial users, but also the residential users as part of the overall plan. So (we) couldn't quite maximize the new bill that just passed which is the additional rental unit.

Mr. Guerber: How many parking spaces did you need?

Mr. Jung: We figured we needed 129 units, so we have 114 on site and then 15 offsite along the street frontage, which will then be, dedicated back to the county. And then as you know, with the Rice Street improvements through the TIGER grant, there's about 70 new stalls going in along the street. I think we counted about 10 along the strip there in front of the building. And we also considered doing a design review with the engineering department so we could take a look at how the project is going to unfold based on the new TIGER grant design and Michael Moule's already talking about removing some bump outs to accommodate more parking so we can have a different entry. So, the entry is aligned more with what's best for the project. So, with that we're trying to do a design guideline, not just with planning but also public works to create the street scape that's envisioned under the TIGER grant.

Mr. Guerber: So what style is this?

Mr. Jung: Honestly, I can't tell you. I don't, I can't, I don't know. I've asked the architect to give me a little narrative and the idea was it was going to be...there's no naming convention per say but his approach was to use the articulation on the street facades on the top three floors like extending some of the units. And then changing the materials like you see here with the horizontal siding with the plastered finish. And this would accentuate the residential nature of the upper floor details with the casing of the windows, so they're inset. So there's room to move, you know to pull those in a little more and allow for a little patio, maybe like a two or three foot patio.

Mr. Guerber: They're only out like a foot or two.

Mr. Jung: They're inset about a foot. But once you – when you take the inset of the windows and then pull those in a little more and then if you push everything out then you would have about two feet.

Mr. Guerber: A little patio.

Mr. Jung: Yes.

Mr. Guerber: How big.

Mr. Jung: About two feet, I would say.

Mr. Guerber: What patio.

Mr. Jung: Two to three foot patio.

Mr. Guerber: Are you demolishing the current building.

Mr. Jung: That's the proposal, yes.

Mr. Guerber: And that's the only thing we need...oh I am sorry.

Ms. Summers: No, go ahead.

Mr. Guerber: And that's the only thing we can really talk about actually, right. That's the only, at this point we can comment on.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: The design, yes.

Mr. Guerber: The whole thing. Okay.

Mr. Jung: And I used to advise this body, so I would say you can provide comments to the architectural design or to the demo of the project because you know you are advisory to the planning commission and the planning department. So then your comments would get incorporated into what the planning commission sees in it and ultimately what we're asking the planning department to do is to do the final design review due to the fast track nature of this project. So we can get their final recommendation of how that buildings going to look when it ultimately gets through building permit approval time. So you have the zoning layer, which this body and the planning department deals with, then the building permit goes through its separate track, right. So we're trying to get the design focused on the zoning portion of the project.

Ms. Summers: What is the roof material on the retail?

Mr. Jung: That is shingling just Arc 80, I believe.

Ms. Summers: For me that feels (like) one of the most out of place things, because it feels like it's an architecture, house residence shingle on top of this retail. I guess I feel like if there was a little more...like I almost want to see even brick or a real concrete on the lowest level and some sort of roof that makes more sense to me above the retail. Or maybe that's the patio. Maybe the roof of that becomes a space that can be occupied by the...

Mr. Jung: If you look at the Līhu'e Town Core Plan the canopy is required. So...

Ms. Summers: Right, which is great.

Mr. Jung: Right, but it's the type of material...

Ms. Summers: Because it provides a rain cover for people walking down the street. But then does it, can that be – I am just thinking of the building right next door is the health. Is it the health building?

Chair Wichman: Yes.

Mr. Jung: Yes.

Ms. Summers: Very square, you know but it has these deep, like Stephen was saying, places where people are walking by, so its kind of activated by that. Then you have the funny little retail that's more the kind of it feels more active I guess or more you feel like you see the people coming and going. Where this feels like everyone's pushed (and) buried far away. Does that make sense?

Mr. Jung: Yes, I know it does.

Ms. Summers: And then I am looking at, its this weird little bridges that go to everybody's places.

Mr. Jung: Yes, to save on cost, obviously, we thought of pulling the (air) conditioning component and so the breezeway would allow for airflow to pop through each of the units.

Ms. Summers: But it doesn't give them any extra space, because its these tiny bridges. So there's nowhere for the potted plants and so I don't know it feels I guess it just feels really devoid of people in that space, I don't know. So I love the idea that both Jim and Stephen were talking about with I don't know, if it's a patio or if it's just something that – I feel like when I go down that street that I see the people going in and out of the spaces more. And does anyone understand what I am saying.

Mr. Guerber: I totally do, absolutely. I think that would be a really wonderful roof top kind of patio with tables and chairs up there, with people. That they could look out on the street and they could see the Christmas lights and all that instead of just a roof. Make it useful.

Ms. Summers: And then we're not seeing that residential shingle...

Mr. Guerber: Potted plants up there, you know. We're talking about making it a more...

Ms. Summers: Urban or I don't even know, yes.

Mr. Jung: We pitched the Kaka'ako style project and that got stepped on.

Chair Wichman: A little modern.

Mr. Guerber: Maybe down the street.

Mr. Long: I feel that the second rendering is an improvement on the first rendering. And I also believe that Mason Architects could do better than this. A little bit of thought and consideration for architectural features, detailing (and) construction methodology.

Mr. Jung: Yes, I had to put a little pressure on Elena Brown who was working on this project, because we were working through Christmas on this to try to get this in by January.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Is there perhaps like a suggestion on the type of building or architectural feature throughout on Rice Street that, you know may suggest that a new design be incorporated.

Mr. Long: Mason Architects is a highly respected historical architectural firm on O‘ahu. I mean they know. And your comment, your architecture of bullet points, oh the Kress Building has concrete so we have concrete here. It’s not even concrete. It’s just like a stucco material (and) has nothing to do with that beautiful, beautiful concrete material on Kress Street. So, I just know they could do better. A little bit of thought and consideration, and not my responsibility.

Ms. Summers: No, but I think we do have a responsibility to try and pick some of the things that appeal to us along Rice Street or in the core and maybe try to give some direction and I think that you actually already did when you brought up the patio’s. To me that brings up what I see when I am looking at some of those buildings where you actually can see. You can see that the building is actually alive, that there are people, they’re not all hidden away from the street. It’s kind of this life and activity and I think that’s what we really...

Mr. Guerber: It’s more organic.

Ms. Summers: Yes.

Mr. Guerber: Rather than concrete.

Ms. Summers: Well, yes, just more life I guess. And I feel like even if we just, well I do feel like that residential shingle is odd for a roof there and if that was maybe activated than that kind of gives that sense of life that feels like it’s kind of missing there.

Mr. Guerber: So this brings up another point for the rest of us. We are in the midst of beginning to develop Rice Street, there are places that have architectural guidelines for areas and we don’t have that on the Rice Street district. Maybe we should be doing that. Or do we have that.

Mr. Jung: You have it in a very broad context. I mean you have three illustrations in the Līhu‘e Town Core Plan as the roof design and the, If you want I can pass this around. Some of the sections are highlighted but it doesn’t give details and I think that’s where we were all lost in trying to fine tune and approach this. And so it has the color palette rule set, so we know what color it has to be all right. We know it can’t have reflective glass, we have three types of roofs we can play with, but for the building design from a massing standpoint there’s not a lot of guidance. And I think that’s where we’re stuck.

Ms. Summers: But even these canopy types like if we did a raised supportive type with...and you did seating or something, I don't know it feels like they could even take some of these suggestions. They're showing balconettes and what else, that's kind of it.

Mr. Jung: So one of the suggestions I could proffer to this body is that we are going for the planning commission next Tuesday and again it's just for the density component and obviously they're going to chime in the design component, as well. The planning director has committed to saying we can allow for the design review and so we could coordinate if it's approved and get our application in on time and we could coordinate having our initial design review with the department and then bring it back to this body for additional comments and I think...

Mr. Guerber: Please.

Ms. Summers: Yes.

Mr. Jung: We could circulate it that way and at that point we could have a more refined iteration that might be a little more palatable. So it's a little unusual from a procedure standpoint, but I think it will work because we do have a requirement in the Lihue Town Core plan to have final design review and if we incorporate that to a condition then we'll have to do it by way of condition of the commission.

Mr. Guerber: Should we do a motion.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Yes.

Chair Wichman: Ready to receive a motion.

Mr. Guerber: I move that we have the applicant come back to us for a design review once you finish with the planning commission, before you get...before building permit.

Mr. Jung: Correct.

Mr. Guerber: Before building permit.

Chair Wichman: Do I hear a second.

Mr. Long: I'll second.

Chair Wichman: Any discussion.

Mr. Guerber: Is that enough of a thing for this whole matter.

Ms. Summers: I think so. Does feel like it's enough.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Yes.

Mr. Jung: I mean I'll comment to that. Our responsibility now is to take feedback from you guys and bring it back to the architectural team (and) say this is what the historic commission is looking at. We're going to have additional comments from the planning commission, and we can combine and compile those comments and tell the planning department all right this is what we heard from your team and get their feedback from the planning department as well. And then we could come up with a final plan to bring back to you folks for additional comment.

Mr. Guerber: Come back to us.

Chair Wichman: Alex has a comment.

Mr. Wong: I'd also like to remind the commission that we should also consider a motion regarding the demolition of the existing structure because that will also be under the permit that is being sought for approval next Tuesday. So...

Chair Wichman: That's true.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: So we already have a motion and second on the floor.

Mr. Long: And discussion of that motion.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Sure

Mr. Long: May I ask you Ian. Do you feel that you've gotten enough specific input from us on a historic basis to go back to your architect with.

Mr. Jung: I think so. Yes.

Chair Wichman: Are we ready for a vote.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Yes. There's a motion and a second.

Chair Wichman: We have two.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: No.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Any ayes. (Unanimous voice vote). Any nays. (Hearing none). Nope, okay, it passes. Motion carried 5:0.

Mr. Long: And now we address the demolition.

Chair Wichman: Yes.

Ms. Summers: So, what were you saying about HABS and SHPD.

Mr. Jung: Well it's obviously my legal opinion that it's not over 51...

Ms. Summers: Oh, no I don't care about that part. Does SHPD require HABS.

Mr. Jung: Normally a HABS study would be done for an actual historic property where you're going to do mitigation plans on to document the historical nature of the building that's getting demo'd. We could do – I worked with Mason Architects on another registered property where we did a HABS study and you know it can be done. But it just comes at an additional costs factored into that. I would suggest, and we could obviously, we're still going to have to go through the SHPD protocol on this to verify whether or not its 50 or 51 years. But what we could do is we could do a 6E form based on the context of the historic district and then get their feedback on that. But as all of you know, it's hard getting a response from SHPD these days, so I am not sure if they would comment back on it, but yes.

Mr. Guerber: So from what I understand, for demolition, no matter what we say you can still demolish the building.

Mr. Jung: That's correct and legally even if it's on the register you could go through the whole process and then if the State says no then the State would have to go and condemn the property from the owner. With a permit you could mitigate the impact and require mitigation to document and take historical notes of what exist and we're happy to do that. And one of the things we discussed with Ms. Griffin was doing, you know a plaque to commemorate one of the first...

Mr. Guerber: Residents.

Mr. Jung: Residents of that particular lot, not necessarily the building. The building from what I've heard in the community it doesn't have like significant architectural value but that's a personal preference.

Ms. Summers: But it represents the time-period...

Mr. Jung: Right, I mean...

Ms. Summers: Very well and it's a building that I think is attractive.

Ms. Larson: I don't its kind of crazy.

Chair Wichman: Stephen.

Mr. Long: With regards to the demolition of the building and mitigating measures and recommendations I believe we have done that and requesting you come back before us with a design and review process and I think that we've come up with probably a half dozen specific mitigating design features.

Mr. Jung: And we could do a HABS type review where we do archival photos of the structure and then get a little more research on who constructed and all that and create a report. Not to the

level of what HABS (would) normally require details and where you got to get (the) Secretary of Interior to bless it.

Ms. Summers: Well, and every little detail drawn to the...

Mr. Jung: Right, because I went through that process and it's...

Ms. Summers: It's difficult.

Mr. Jung: It takes a year, you know, it's quite a long process.

Ms. Summers: Can we ask for what you just said like a HABS.

Mr. Guerber: So I move that if you do a demolish this building that you take photographs and document what the building was before it comes down and do a job like the HABS would be not quite as much but document what was there before. That's good enough right.

Ms. Summers: I like that.

Chair Wichman: That was a motion, yes.

Ms. Summers: I second that motion.

Mr. Long: Any discussion.

Chair Wichman: Discussion.

Mr. Long: Within a placement of a plaque and some of the other mitigating factors in my recommendation be a part of that motion.

Mr. Guerber: Yes.

Chair Wichman: Do we need to redo the motion, since we had a second.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Yes, I mean you could be a friendly amendment to your initial motion.

Mr. Guerber: Someone could second the motion as revised.

Ms. Summers: I second that motion, as revised.

Mr. Guerber: Right.

Chair Wichman: And you have all that. Yes. Okay. All righty. So discussion. One thing I am kind of curious about if there's a plaque and there were former people that lived there can we maybe have photographs if there are any such photographs of anything. Even of the Central

Pacific Bank, I mean it's something. You know, a hundred years down the line it's going to mean something right.

Mr. Jung: Yes, we actually undertook a phase one of a sight assessment project just to evaluate any environmental issues that may have been on the property, maybe because the area has been disturbed quite a bit. And there was from what I recall a storage unit a laundry facility, so we wanted to evaluate whether or not there was any contaminants there. So, as part of the phase one it goes back tax overlooks those old maps and we have maps from 1927, to present which show status of structures. So we kind of already have a base line of what existed as a history of the property.

Chair Wichman: So you could have like a little historic wall or something like that about the area.

Mr. Jung: Yes. That's definitely something we could look at doing because apparently the county is going to be doing some things on Rice Street from what I understand, plaques...

Chair Wichman: It's still good to...

Mr. Jung: Chickens. There's chicken monuments going up and some kind of ice cream cone monument, from what I understand. So.

Mr. Guerber: This is the middle of Līhu'e, it's probably the center of what is Līhu'e. I am thinking prehistory. What was here before contact? If you demolish you're going to expose a bunch of soil that may never have been...no archaeology has ever been done on it.

Chair Wichman: That's true.

Mr. Guerber: You probably should say something about that.

Mr. Jung: There actually was...there was a study in the area, we don't have the full – before they were called archaeological inventory surveys or archaeological inspections, I think is what they called them. But there was something done on the property and if you walk down Rice Street you can see how the properties leveled off and then drops down before the Watumull Plaza. So there was a ton of fill that was brought in, in that area after the single-family residence was done. So from my context, I don't think we need to do a full archaeological inventory survey, let alone archaeological monitoring because it's already fully disturbed. I worked on the Kaua'i Museum Project and they recorded archaeological inventory survey for new post that were going in, which I was very surprised on after I came onto the project. But I think at that point its overkill but that's my own opinion on it. Because there was a lot of fill if you do walk by the property you'll how its leveled for the parking lot area and then drops down. And even as you walk up to Rice Street it kind of tapers off.

Mr. Guerber: What's the impact to that place that was just built or being built right now. What is that in the middle of this U shape building you're...

Mr. Jung: Yes, so we...I've met with Lester Calipjo is the owner of that particular property and we met and one of things we worked out is maybe doing a shared entry so we have a single entry...I am sorry it'll be a shared exit for us shared entry for him. But our and that building is kind of a unique design as well. There's a lot of comments in the community about that but that particular – our building would have our parking as the buffer so would be structure to structure there'd be a buffer between the parking lot. We'd have some vegetative arrangements to kind of block off our parking lot from those four residential units back there.

Chair Wichman: I have a question about when you talk about fill. As an archaeologist I know that we dig through a lot of fill and we still find things. So it depends on how much fill there is, I mean, how deep the building or the settings are going you know, whether you're going to disturb that or not, you know. But we have found that under fill, so...

Mr. Jung: Yes, we had a Geotech (Geotechnical Engineering) team out there so we can – I'll get that report and bring it back to this body...

Chair Wichman: Thanks.

Mr. Jung: See how when they did the borings how much fill was there...

Chair Wichman: Great. Thank you, Ian. Thank you. That would help.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: So, I think there's a motion and second on the floor.

Chair Wichman: Okay.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Just need a vote.

Chair Wichman: A vote, okay. All those in favor. (Unanimous voice vote). Any opposed. (Hearing none). Nope, so passed. Motion carried 5:0.

Mr. Jung: Thank you commissioners and we'll be back to hear your comments.

Chair Wichman: And we can get Carolyn back in here.

3. Discussion regarding a possible amendment to the Kaua'i Historical Preservation Review Commission Rules and Regulations regarding the minimum requirements for project presentations before the Kaua'i Historical Preservation Review Commission.

a. Director's Report pertaining to this matter.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: So, I believe this item was related to commissioner Long's request that there be like guidelines, or criteria, or checklist be provided to applicants to guide what is minimally required for any proposals before you folks. So, in your materials there's just a really rough draft form of a checklist on items that are required. The very last page of the packet.

Carolyn Larson returned to the meeting.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: So, you know I think it's an opportunity I think going forward. A couple years ago with the Open Space Commission, Ka'āina Hull, the Deputy Director at the time, now Director, and I as my other hat as an attorney, we helped to draft rules, amendments to the open space rules to sort of guide analysis. One the procedures and analysis for any proposals that go before the open space commission. I think similarly we have an opportunity to maybe consider going forward, creating amendments to our rules. That would help guide how you folks would analyze proposals, be it private projects, and these analysis would then be folded into or forwarded to the planning commission for those higher level permits, Class III's, Class IV's and then to the department for Class I & II permits. For us to consider incorporating into conditions of approval or if its State projects or it's a 106 review where really we're creating recommendations for Federal highways or the State to incorporate into the project. So, I think it's an opportunity something to just consider going forward. Again what you were provided with is just really a rough draft of, you know, basic information that you folks will need for proposals, so.

Chair Wichman: I have a question. Since this is just the start of the checklist can we take this home...

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Yes.

Chair Wichman: Think about it and write our comments on it and...

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Yes

Chair Wichman: Bring it back to the next meeting.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: That sounds great.

Chair Wichman: Thank you.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Yes, we can do that and put this item back on the agenda in March.

Mr. Guerber: Let's keep it on the agenda for awhile. That's fine.

Chair Wichman: I think this is going to take some discussion.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Sure, okay, sounds good.

Mr. Guerber: Because I would certainly like to see pictures of what's there currently.

Ms. Summers: I think that would be helpful.

Chair Wichman: Would be very helpful, yes.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Okay.

Ms. Summers: And if there's a survey already done, that they give it to us before they come.

Mr. Guerber: Yes, so what does it look like now. What is the proposed look from it. Give us an idea of what we are judging.

Chair Wichman: Then we can tone down on the deferments.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Okay.

Mr. Guerber: Yes.

Mr. Long: I just have a couple of comments. The first is thank you very much to the planning department for expanding...

Chair Wichman: Absolutely.

Mr. Long: What I suggested or minimum requirements. Thank you Alex, really Jodi, great job. On the last item, you know for just all projects applicants. I'd like to see the word "existing" and "proposed". So existing site plan, existing floor plans, plural...

Ms. Summers: Good idea.

Mr. Long: For existing elevations, scope of work to include description of proposed materials and finishes. It's materials and finishes. And then that was with photographs also of the existing. And then the proposed would be all of that but no photographs. Rendering if can, but it's not a requirement.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Okay. Okay, great.

Mr. Guerber: Great.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Sounds good. Okay, we'll put this matter back on the agenda for the next time.

Mr. Guerber: Should we make a motion do it...

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Yes, I mean that might help wrap it up...

Mr. Guerber: And act next time.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Sure, you can defer this matter 'till the next meeting agenda.

Chair Wichman: It is under new business, so maybe we should do that.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Yes.

Mr. Guerber: Yes, but I am thinking if matters are coming to us next month would be nice to have this be published to those people so they know what they're going to have to bring to us.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: I think we can work with the applicants directly knowing that this is the direction and so Alex, as a planner can help steer applicants to provide these things. And then going forward we can solidify that as an actual rule. Yes.

Mr. Guerber: Okay.

Mr. Long: Thank you and the reason that I brought it up because when I went to a counter as a person from the public...

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Yes.

Mr. Long: You know I really kind of wanted to be handed an 8-1/2 by 11 sheet saying you're going in front of KHPRC here do this, so thank you. And thank you for doing that in the interim. Because we may have items that come up you know before our next meeting and let's just take care of this before it becomes memorialized.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Sounds good. Okay. So perhaps a motion to defer this matter.

Ms. Summers: I motion that we defer this until the next meeting.

Chair Wichman: We have a motion.

Mr. Guerber: I second that.

Chair Wichman: Jim second. Any discussion.

Ms. Summers: The only discussion I have is I really feel like I want to understand more the archaeological and historical aspects of what we're looking at, so I can put it on you guys to help me understand that better. I would really appreciate that. Maybe some points to be added to this that are more kind of where you're coming from.

Ms. Larson: This is a proposed checklist of what people should bring, presenters should bring.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Yes, and if there's anything missing from the perspective of anything required to reflect any archaeological items then, yes...

Ms. Summers: Or even just history. I liked your...I think I understood what you were talking about with the bridge, but I feel it's making me think in a different way and I really appreciate that.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Motion, second and I...

Chair Wichman: Motion, second and all in favor. (Unanimous voice vote). Any nays. (Hearing none). So passed, its deferred. Motion passed 6:0.

K. COMMISSION EDUCATION COMMITTEE

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: We have no items under this agenda item.

Chair Wichman: May I mention something under this. We've never had an education committee.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: I think...

Chair Wichman: We did at one time. Kuulei Santos was the head of it and I was on it as well. But, we didn't do anything.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Oh. Okay.

Chair Wichman: She went to a conference in San Diego and came back with all these great ideas and then nothing happened. So, I am not sure if we want to restart this...

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Okay.

Chair Wichman: And what it would entail. So I am just throwing it out there.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: You know what we'll do actually for (items) K., L. and M. perhaps we can just research the formation of these, whether it's a PIG, the permitted interaction group and what the scope was. And then we kind of give an update on where each of these committees are and whether they should be...new members should be assigned to these to complete the initial underlying scope or whether is should be disbanded. So, maybe we put that on for the next time.

Mr. Guerber: Lets erase it.

Chair Wichman: Except for L. and M. we do have...or L. especially...

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Okay.

Chair Wichman: We do have something to say about that...

Mr. Guerber: We have another PIG starting again, right.

Chair Wichman: Pardon.

Mr. Guerber: We having a PIG that's starting again.

Chair Wichman: Well we...these are all PIG's already, right. So L., Jodi you weren't at the last meeting...

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Right.

Chair Wichman: Right. So L. we did talk about. Remember Stephen. It's the inventory.

Mr. Long: Oh, I thought about that. And our PIG should schedule our first meeting maybe with the support of planning department staff and lay out a game plan and who's going to do what and how we're going to do it. You know sort of a first introductory meeting.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Okay.

Ms. Larson: Who is on that PIG.

Chair Wichman: Stephen Long, Alex Wong, Jim Guerber and myself.

Ms. Summers: And isn't Gerald on it.

Chair Wichman: And Gerald, I am sorry. That's right.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Okay. Yes and we can coordinate with the members on scheduling a site visit or meeting. Yes.

Mr. Long: Do we want to set a time now or want to do this, do that in-house.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Yes, I would think we could probably, especially yes, perhaps Alex can take the lead and schedule that off and coordinate our schedules amongst you folks.

Mr. Guerber: Like think about just before the next meeting, like an hour before.

Mr. Long: That sounds good to me.

Mr. Guerber: That's convenient for everybody.

Chair Wichman: Yes, it is.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Okay.

L. KAUA'I HISTORIC RESOURCE INVENTORY UPDATE COMMITTEE

M. HISTORIC PRESERVATION PUBLICITY COMMITTEE

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: This one again I might...

Mr. Guerber: We've never done it.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Yes, so we'll research the history of it and see...

Chair Wichman: Yes, we talked about it one time and I don't think anything became of it.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Okay.

N. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: We are in a series...well I think Shan may have reached out to you folks to try to schedule one-on-ones. The West Kaua'i Community Plan update is at the point where the draft, department draft, is being discussed at the planning commission. And within the plan itself there's several sections that would probably have interest with you folks. Most particularly the shared spaces and the heritage resources sections where the department did a whole bunch of outreach and to identify important shared spaces and also heritage resources. So, if you folks have any suggestions or comments, I think please let us know. I think the West Kaua'i Community Plan as a whole is going to be discussed before the planning commission for a couple months, I'd say. And then we also...there is a form based code measure that's also being proposed. I am not sure if I can do it justice but it is I guess a method to implement some of the policies, recommended in the plan and it relates to the form and character to the towns. So there's one in Kekaha proposed...it'll work – I mean I don't want to get too detailed it's more so just an announcement. We can go over it a little more when we're meeting one-on-one, but okay. But so again just wanted to announce this is a process that is being discussed right now. We are seeking public comments, as well as your folks comments and yes, we'll talk again. And we'll also schedule a formal briefing at the next meeting in March.

Chair Wichman: Thank you.

O. SELECTION OF NEXT MEETING DATE AND AGENDA TOPICS (3/19/2020)

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: The next meeting is March 19, 2020. We have a number of things that are going to be, carried over. I am sorry. The rules and the West Kaua'i Community Plan and I think we have a couple applications that will be in the pipeline for that day also.

Mr. Guerber: Oh, can I ask something. I just got this in the mail yesterday. I really would appreciate it if we could get it sooner so...and it really helps if we have enough time to go out to the site and see it in person, if we can find the time to do it. It would be great if I knew a couple weeks ahead of time what was going to come up. I didn't need to see the whole thing, I don't need to see Alex's report I just need to go out there and familiarize myself with, what's the street like, what's the building like now, you know.

Ms. Higuchi-Sayegusa: Okay, yes. We can work on that for sure. Okay, any other.

Chair Wichman: Any other.

P. ADJOURNMENT

Ms Summers: I motion to adjourn the meeting.

Chair Wichman: Motion to adjourn. Second.

Ms. Larons: Second.

Chair Wichman: Second by Carolyn. All right, motion adjourned. Thank you. Motion carried 6:0.

Chair Wichman adjourned the meeting at 6:17 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sandra M. Muragin
Commission Support Clerk

() Approved as circulated.

() Approved with amendments. See minutes of meeting.